

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1900.

THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION.

THE Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America was held at Columbia University in New York on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, December 27, 28, 29, 1899. In calling the meeting to order, and in introducing President Seth Low of Columbia, the President of the Association, Prof. von Jagemann of Harvard, himself one of the pioneer members, referred to the circumstance that sixteen years before the Association had held its first meeting at Columbia. President Low welcomed the Association on behalf of Columbia: He had not realized that the Association was returning to its natal place; but while this was at the old site on 49th Street and the buildings had changed, the greeting was as hearty and cordial as ever. A university, like the arc-light, sheds rays on every hand; through specialization, like the head light, it also illuminates very distinctly a narrow path. The study of the Modern Languages, particularly, enlarges the world in which a man lives. It used to be considered enough to know what ancient wisdom had to say; there is also wisdom in contemporary life. These studies insisted on equal rights with others, and nothing more strongly forced the elective system upon the colleges. For all these reasons the subjects treated by the Association command the hearty sympathy of all workers, and it is because Columbia has this sympathy that these few words have been said.

Every meeting seems to have a definite note struck which becomes characteristic. The dominant note sounded at the University of Virginia the year before was that of the new romanticism (see article in *Univ. Va. Alumni Bulletin*, Feb., 1899); somehow, it seemed to comport with the mild weather and the bright Southern skies. In New York cold and some snow prevailed, and the wind whistling about University Heights seemed to demand greater severity. The sum of the impressions from the

papers at the Columbia meeting was more complex, but gave clear evidence of added variety, intensity, and strength. Growth in many directions, and in various interests, is the marked characteristic of the work of the Association for the four or five years from the time of the Whitney Memorial Meeting at Pennsylvania, and the Yale meeting of 1895.

This will be evident from a rough division into which the papers of the present meeting may conveniently fall: I. Rhetorical Method—a newer phase and a distinct note coming from an evident general literary aspiration, and an altogether new attention to scientific pedagogical and rhetorical theory, and practical composition work in school and college. II. Modern Literature—the period after the middle of the sixteenth century—under which a larger and larger proportion of papers tends to fall. III. Medieval Literature. IV. Linguistic Studies. V. Phonetics. And VI. Pedagogical Discussion—arising from the publication of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Modern Language teaching.

I. *Rhetorical Method.* The President's address by Prof. von Jagemann of Harvard on "Philology and Purism" gave early suggestion for the later animated discussion on Dictionaries and Grammar. Every language needs new modes of expression. What general principles should govern their adoption, and what can be done to cause these principles to be accepted? Too narrow ground has been taken in previous efforts. Use in this or that masterpiece, by any given author, or in any country, as in America but not in England, matters little: the real question is, to what extent has the language to gain or lose, and how far are the advantages and disadvantages balanced? The joke about the proof-reader changing the Dictionary was not that he changed it, but that people laughed at him because he did change it. The philologist can take the initiative in efforts to improve speech because his knowledge of the language and literature of all periods better enables him to understand and to judge fully literary and linguistic problems.

In a paper "On Modern English Dictionaries" Miss Leavens of Brooklyn, who adopted as her

text Hamlet's reply to Polonius, "Words, words, words," started a very general discussion on common usage, inaccuracies of speech, changes, and questions of authority. Prof. Emerson of Western Reserve emphasized the need in all the Dictionaries of the scientific treatment and application of the law of Germanic accent, with the consequent changes in usage and meaning. The discussion thus started grew in momentum with the next paper on the "Figurative elements in the terminology of English Grammar" by Prof. Scott of Michigan—an interesting psychological study based on experiments in the Detroit schools. Taking definitions from Whitney's English Grammar he sought to find out the images aroused by the words in the child's mind. "Parts" of speech were conceived as "organs" of speech; the verb "governs" the noun as the teacher governs school; the "irregular" verb was a naughty one, or was one used in the wrong place, or one seldom used; the "objective" case was something to throw at, as, "The boy hit the dog"; a "case" was a box, or a chest of drawers, even a covering for sausages, or, from the practise of diagrams, something dropped below. The writer admitted any other designations would be just as bad, and urged a closer connection between Grammar and living speech. Prof. Stoddard of New York found no particular objections that images were aroused, but was inclined to think that such conceptions were those of older minds commenting later on the phenomena. This doubt was likewise expressed by Prof. Cohn of Columbia: he could not recall ever having any such conceptions. Prof. Todd of Columbia believed no one would likely have, such who, like Prof. Cohn and himself, had obtained their grammatical ideas through Latin terminology. Prof. Bright of Johns Hopkins declared if the terminology thus stimulated the imagination, it was no ways objectionable. Prof. Greene of Johns Hopkins queried what could be used? We are bound to have some terminology.

A fourth paper connected with these was that of Dr. Buck of Vassar on "The present status of rhetorical theory." The "anti-social" conception of discourse by the Sophists treated Rhetoric as an art of war, a struggle of the

strong against the weak, and brought a false stigma upon the name. Plato gave it a "social" conception, where it was held to be a process of direct communication and transfer from speaker to hearer whose interests were one. The modern theory in the best text-books accepts this, as at least implied if not explicitly stated. No longer limited to Persuasion alone, the subject-matter has direct relation to all mental processes: the modern study of Rhetoric is as large in outline as formerly, and more complete in details.

II. *Modern Literature.* The contemporary spirit which was prominent at the Virginia meeting, was again here; but it was not romantic. "Fatalism in Hauptmann's dramas" was the subject of a paper by Dr. Schuetze of Pennsylvania. It was not an isolated phenomenon treated, but one representative of extreme naturalism as derived from Taine's theories by Zola, Tolstoi, Hardy, Pinero, Ibsen, the later Bjørnsen, Max Halbe, Hauptmann, and others. In Germany Sudermann and Ludwig Fulda do not belong here. Materialism is the dominant factor, the positive philosophy of John Stuart Mill being its source. Zola gave the prescription in his *roman experimental*, whereby everything is due to heredity and *milieu*: collect facts, group them, and deduce. In classical German drama, in Shakespeare, Schiller, Kleist, there is absolute freedom of will and the characters are held responsible; in this school there is no responsibility and no moral guilt. Outside forces determine character, and action can be calculated with unerring precision. In America Howells gives details, but does not bring out their fatal bearing, as does the English Hardy. With Hauptmann the scenery of the first act is not accidental, but significant, and is suggestive of the hereditary acts. There is an absence of great characters due to the plea that the author is not responsible for his characters. The 'brutal fact,' all characteristic, is the device of contrast in bringing the idea of fatalism home. Related to this paper was one read by title, by Prof. Faust of Wesleyan, on "Problematical characters in German fiction," tracing a certain type from Goethe, through Jean Paul, Spielhagen, and Keller, to Sudermann.

In sharp contrast with this analysis of Ger-

man "fatalism" was the interpretation of English "idealism" in "The Nature Poetry of Shelley and his contemporaries" by Prof. Edgar of Toronto. The part of the paper given was a comparison between Shelley and Keats. Keats' treatment of Nature was frankly sensuous and pagan, as in the *Nightingale* and in *Endymion*; Shelley's was more spiritual and with a higher mystical perception of Beauty. As colourists it is commonly thought that Keats surpasses Shelley; but a tabulated statement of colour effects in both proves Shelley's variety to be astonishing. Grant Allen's dictum that poets use the red end of the spectrum rather than the violet, from the results obtained, must also be amended.

"The first centenary of the birth of Leopardi" by Prof. Menger of Bryn Mawr, should have been noted the year before (June 29, 1898). There was a celebration by the students of Rome and by the Government. The first took the form of a movement to have a course of lectures at the University; prizes were offered for the best essay and for poems; a monument was erected; and a memorial published. Despite drawbacks and difficulties the movement was made national: many lyrics were called forth; inedited Mss. brought out; his tomb declared a national monument; a bust placed in the Senate house; and streets and buildings in his native province named for him. Mr. Shaw of Johns Hopkins commented at some length upon Leopardi's melancholy, and spoke of the new explanation for this in his suffering from a weakness of the perceptive faculties, a failure to distinguish color, and the inability of the sensory organs generally to represent the outside world.

It was the year of the 150th anniversary of Goethe's birth, and two or three papers derived immediately from Goethe. Prof. Faust's paper, already mentioned, started from a definition by Goethe: "problematical characters" are those "who can never master the situation into which they are placed, yet to whom no situation in life is adequate," and traced a type of character from Goethe. "The curse-idea in Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris*" by Dr. Eggert of Chicago was read, in his absence, by Prof. Gruener of Yale. The paper was directed chiefly against a theory of Kuno Fischer's.

Goethe, the student of evolution, could not use an antiquated superstition as a motive for the noble conception of Iphigenie. The law of heredity would explain the deeds of ancestors, and the intensely modern character of the drama leaves no room for the operation of a curse. Prof. Thomas of Columbia believed that Goethe was essentially a poet of the concrete, and that the starting point was the concrete mental image and not an abstract idea.

"The first paralipomenon of Goethe's *Faust*, when written?" a paper by Prof. Manning of Delaware, entered the lists for an earlier date than those generally assigned. All the conditions were realized in the early seventies; if written later than 1775, it is not significant. Things got clearer as Goethe cleared them. The plan is in Goethe's own hand, and shows the influence of Spinoza's *Ethics* upon his youth. Men write abstractly in early life and become concrete later.

"Contributions to English literary criticism culled from eighteenth century letter writers," by Prof. Hulme of Western Reserve, was only announced by title—a contemplated study of the English letter writers of that period with reference to the literary criticism scattered through their pages. Another eighteenth century contribution was "A study of Pope's Imitations of Horace," by Prof. Tupper of Ontario, from a comparison with the Latin originals. Pope's personal tone is keener, more like Juvenal than the urbane Horace, and Pope has many individual affectations of manner. Changes from the Latin are made to suit English conditions; but in spirit, contrary to Dr. Johnson's opinion, between Roman similitudes and English images there is no real difference.

The Elizabethan drama and Shakespeare were the sources of two papers. "The influence of Court Masques on the drama, 1605-15," by Prof. Thorndike of Western Reserve, brought Shakespeare's latest work into question. The date of *The Winter's Tale* may be determined from the anti-masque of the Satyrs which appeared in Ben Jonson's *Oberon* in 1611. So the masque in *The Tempest* throws light on the play: Shakespeare adopted the convention and forced it into service with his imagination. "The episodes in Shakespeare's *I. Henry VI*," by Prof. Henneman of Tennes-

see, touched Shakespeare at his beginning period. It was sought to make more definite what had hitherto been vague suggestion, as to just where and how specific repetitions and contradictions and obvious developments show that an older Talbot play was worked over into a Henry VI. drama. In the discussion Prof. Hulme of Western Reserve cited from Madden's *Diary of Master William Silence* two references to Elizabethan sport that he held to be undoubted passages of Shakespeare's, and with Madden he thought such references to outdoor life constituted a new test of Shakespeare's genuine work, though their absence could not of itself disprove Shakespeare's authorship. Prof. Garnett of Baltimore also concurred in the belief that an older Talbot play had been worked over, and that the wooing scene was Shakespeare's and had been inserted to prepare for Part ii.

III. *Medieval Literature.* The paper by Prof. Rennert of Pennsylvania on "The Spanish poet Luis Barahona de Soto," which was read by title, treating an author praised by Cervantes, lies on the border-land between medieval and modern, and, although nearer the modern, is best grouped with kindred Spanish subjects. "An incident in the *Poema de Fernan Gonzalez*," by Prof. Marden of Johns Hopkins, strove, by fixing the relations between certain portions of the Spanish epic poem and corresponding chapters of the Prose Chronicle of Alfonso the Wise, to determine more exactly the date. Count Fernan Gonzalez is one of the most interesting figures in old Spanish literature, and the poem written in his honor contains the earliest version of many well-known legends of Christian Spain. The paper was discussed by Prof. de Haan of Bryn Mawr and Dr. Bourland of Michigan. Dr. Bourland contributed a kindred paper "On the date of the *Rimed Chronicle* of the Cid." This was not an unformed series of songs, but a fragment of a lost composition possessing unity of design. The MS. belongs to the fifteenth century, but the date of the fragment lies between 1225 and 1250, and is younger than the "Poem of the Cid." The conclusions were discussed by Prof. Howland of Chicago.

Only one Old French paper was presented to the Association, and that was announced by

title: "The latest researches concerning Arras in the thirteenth century, and Adan de la Hale," by Prof. Rambeau of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A related paper read by title was that of Prof. Bruce of Bryn Mawr: "Vita Meriadoci: a Latin romance of the thirteenth century, preserved in the Cotton MS. Faustina B. vi."

Three of the papers in medieval literature were on English subjects. One that created particular interest by its admirable presentation was "The Round Table Before Wace," by Mr. Brown of Harvard. Wace makes the first mention of the Round Table in his *Roman de Brut* in 1155, and says he follows Celtic traditions; but as Geoffrey of Monmouth says nothing of these, many of the best scholars have believed that Wace invented his statements. Layamon's *Brut* translates Wace with many new and curious additions, particularly about the Round Table; and it is likely he borrowed from Welsh tradition. The Greek historian, Posidonius, describes the Celts sitting at feasts. The incidents are always barbarous and primitive, the names are unknown, or where known approach Welsh spellings. More positive evidence are the tales of quarrels at feasts common to Celtic literature. The strongest warrior received a particular place at table, and from quarrels of precedence the Round Table was first used. The only argument against the Celtic origin is Silence; but the Mss. are not old, and we must go to Irish literature, where there are Irish banquet tales as early as the seventh century. All the many coincidences go to show that Layamon's account is not a fabrication, but a transcript of genuine Welsh tradition: the traditions are Pan-Celtic and thus were current in Britain and so in Wales. Prof. Bright of Johns Hopkins believed the conclusion the true one, and commended the method. He further suggested a question as to the precise meaning of Posidonius in describing the Celts who "sit in a circle, and the bravest sit in the middle, like the coryphæus of a chorus." The coryphæus, leading the chorus, would face outward from the circle; the chief would face inward. He sat, not in the centre, but in the middle with others on either hand. Posidonius continues: the "spear-bearers sit down opposite in a circle,

and feast in the same manner as their masters." The circular table would naturally interest the older nations as a variation from the Sigma tables.

"The Lambeth version of Havelok," by Mr. Putnam of Harvard, brought out that this version could not be derived from either of the two French versions in Gaimar and the Lay, differing independently from both. It must come from a lost French original, the common source of all three. With this Lambeth version as a check on each of the two French versions, it is possible to determine with some accuracy the form of the story in the lost version. This lost French version and the English romance probably go back to still earlier sources. Comments were made by Prof. Bright. The paper by Prof. McKnight of Ohio on "Germanic elements in King Horn," proceeding from the origin of the legend in the Danish invasions, sought to distinguish the traits which were common Germanic. The death of Horn's father and the adventures were held to have been originally more prominent; the love features developed later. The nationality of the love element was more difficult to determine, and many lines were hard to draw with clearness, even where a seeming Germanic nucleus of details could be traced.

IV. *Linguistic Studies.* These papers were all evidently the results of unusual thoroughness and care: two were on German subjects and one on English. The first was the paper by Prof. Kurrelmeyer of Franklin and Marshall, "On the historical development of the types of the first person plural imperative in German." Both Low German and High German were taken into account; eight types were treated in detail; and it was found that a certain type was a criterion for the date and original dialect of certain texts. This last discovery and the conscientious accuracy of the work were highly commended by Prof. Vos of Johns Hopkins. Prof. Vos' paper on "Rime-parallelism in Old High-German verse" was something akin. Rime-parallelism was characteristic of three of five works considered: a result agreeing with the supposed order of composition. Some light was thrown on the origin of rime in German and on the length of suffix syllables in Otfried.

"The appositive participle in Anglo-Saxon," by Prof. Calloway of Texas, was based upon a careful statistical reading of the whole of Anglo-Saxon literature, and of the more definitely known Latin originals of the prose texts. Divisions and classifications were given and illustrated: adjectival, predicate, adverbial, and co-ordinate. The origin is, in the main, from the Latin. Profs. Hart and Bright contributed to the discussion.

V. *Phonetics.* Last year it was Prof. Grandgent of Harvard, this year it was Prof. Hempl of Michigan, that read a paper under this head. Prof. Hempl had for his subject: "A'n't and h'n't." To the same two gentlemen, and to Mr. Babbitt of Columbia as Secretary, is due much of the activity of the American Dialect Society, the annual meeting of which was called by Prof. Grandgent for noon of Friday.

VI. *Pedagogical Discussion.* The last afternoon session was devoted to the final discussion of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Modern Language teaching, but little or none was brought out beyond the interesting fact that in certain quarters the Report was selling for money. The paper of Prof. Joynes of South Carolina on "Dictation and Composition in Modern Language teaching," in his absence, was postponed for the expected discussion of the Report to follow: it urged that writing by dictation should have a much larger place and should substitute composition largely, if not wholly, during the earlier stages of study. The Report of the Committee of Twelve was formally submitted, as a U. S. Government document, by the chairman, Prof. Thomas of Columbia, who spoke for its acceptance for the principles involved, and not because of agreement in every particular. Prof. Hewett of Cornell, while differing personally in many points, regarded the Report as a monumental work denoting marked progress in Modern Language study, and moved its adoption. Prof. von Jagemann of Harvard and others expressed their commendation and indebtedness to the vigour and precision and clearness of the Report. It was then unanimously adopted.

At a previous session Prof. Magill of Swarthmore submitted his report on the practise of International Correspondence, as a means of Modern Language study, which, he believed,

was proving remarkably successful. The report was approved and the committee enlarged and continued.

The discussion not brought out by the Committee of Twelve was called forth by a suggestion of Prof. Cohn of Columbia as to the advisability of assigning not more than two papers to each session, so as to leave more time for general discussion, not diminishing at all any number of papers to be read by title or to be published. A very general animated, and in part irrelevant, debate followed, in which Prof. Cohn of Columbia, Magill of Swarthmore, Hewett of Cornell, Stoddard of New York, Price and Thomas of Columbia, Bright of Johns Hopkins, Bowen of Ohio, Harris of Western Reserve, Gudeman of Pennsylvania, Hart of Cornell, and others, engaged. Prof. Cohn, having succeeded in his genial purpose of encouraging discussion at the meetings, withdrew his suggestion.

Among important matters brought up by the Secretary of the Association, Prof. Bright mentioned the purposes of the King Alfred Memorial in 1901, in which all English-speaking people are invited to share. A statue is to be erected and a public hall in Winchester, and a meeting of scholars will be held. A committee to prepare a suitable programme, with a view to taking part in this meeting, was appointed: Profs. Bright of Johns Hopkins, Cook of Yale, Hempl of Michigan, Henneman of Tennessee, Kittredge of Harvard, Manly of Chicago, and Mead of Wesleyan. Also interest was bespoken in the celebration of Dr. Furnivall's seventy-fifth birthday: a personal present to be given, a volume to be published in his honour, and, particularly, money contributions asked, for the cause of continuing the great work of the Early English Text Society in publishing inedited texts.

Several members of the Association were removed by death within the year: Prof. Hempl of Michigan read resolutions on George A. Hench of Michigan; Prof. Henneman of Tennessee on W. M. Baskervill of Vanderbilt; and Prof. Bright on D. L. Bartlett of Baltimore, D. C. Brinton of University of Pennsylvania, and Susan R. Cutler of Chicago, A. N. van Daell of Mass. Inst. of Technology, J. Luquiens of Yale, E. Kölbing of Breslau.

The committee on place of next meeting

(Prof. Learned of Pennsylvania, chairman), reported in favor of Philadelphia, to meet jointly with the Philological and other Associations next Christmas. The committee on election of officers (Prof. Henneman, chairman), reported the following for 1900: President, Thomas R. Price of Columbia; Secretary, James W. Bright of Johns Hopkins; Treasurer, Herbert E. Greene of Johns Hopkins; Executive Council: H. A. Rennert of Pennsylvania, G. Gruener of Yale, Pelham Edgar of Toronto, Ewald Flügel of Stanford, S. W. Cutting of Chicago, B. P. Bourland of Michigan, R. E. Blackwell of Randolph-Macon, E. S. Joynes of South Carolina, T. A. Jenkins of Vanderbilt. Officers of Phonetic and Pedagogical Sections to be continued; Editorial Committee, C. H. Grandgent of Harvard and the Secretary of the Central Division.

Before adjournment, by motion of Prof. Bright, the thanks of the Association were tendered to the members of the Local Committee, to President and Mrs. Low, to the officers of Columbia University and of the Century and University Clubs, for their hospitality and many courtesies.

These courtesies and attentions filled in a large part of the meeting, and determined its high degree of sociableness. For this the members of the Local Committee (Messrs. Price, Cohn, Thomas, Stoddard, Mott, Hyde, and Remy) were all solicitous. The University Library, Gymnasium, and buildings were open to the members; on Thursday at one Luncheon was served by the Local Committee; that evening President and Mrs. Low received the members at their residence; and thereafter the hospitality of the Century Club and of the University Club in its sumptuous new quarters was enjoyed. In the same spirit was the Kneipe on Wednesday evening, with nearly a hundred in attendance, carefully provided by Profs. Cohn and Thomas, where mingled the song of *Gaudeamus* and the patriotic hymns of France, Germany, England, and America. In face of the countless distractions of a metropolis the preservation of the solidarity of the meetings was a striking feature; and from all there is left the distinct remembrance of good fellowship and good work.

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

University of Tennessee.

THE FIRST AMERICAN REPRINT
OF WORDSWORTH.

On Friday evening, January 15, 1802, the *Gazette of the United States*, published in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, contained this advertisement:-

James Humphreys, (at the N. W. Corner of Walnut and Dock-Streets,) has just published *Lyrical Ballads*, with other poems: two volumes in one by W. Wordsworth. Of the lengthy and handsome Eulogies from the *British Reviews* on the above Work, room permits but of the following short extracts; namely, From the *British Critic*.

"—of these Poems it is evident, that they are not to be confounded with the flood of poetry which is poured forth in such profusion by the modern Bards of science, or their brethren the Bards of insipidity: the author has thought for himself; he has deeply studied human nature in the book of human action; and he has adopted his language from the same sources as his feelings."

"—The interest, especially of the *Brothers*, is so wrought up, the minute touches are so accurately studied, the general effect is so insensibly produced, and appeals so forcibly to the heart, as to rank its Author far beyond the reach of common-place praise or censure."

As one reads it the question arises as to how this James Humphreys, whose name appears in the book as editor as well as publisher, became aware of the existence of the ballads which, at that date, were known to but few, and praised by fewer still. One would like to think that some of those Quaker friends on whose share in the Alfoxden life William Howitt so lovingly insists, sent the volume of 1798 as a treasure-trove to the Friendly City beyond the seas, but there is no evidence to support this pleasant fancy. Humphreys himself was no Quaker. Born in Philadelphia, January 18, 1748/49, the records of Christ Church show his baptism on the fifteenth of the following February. In course of time his son's name is on the same register, and on February 4, 1810, he was buried in Christ Church Yard.

He bore the same name as his father, a conveyancer, and was educated in Philadelphia with a view to his becoming a physician, but, disliking that profession, he became an apprentice to William Bradford, one of the most prominent of the colonial printers. He went into business for himself, and in January, 1775, he

published a newspaper. Previous to the Revolution several important books came from his press, among them Sterne's *Works* in five volumes, and Whittenhall's *Greek Grammar*, which, if not the first, was at least one of the earliest books printed from Greek type in America.

Humphreys must have been a most restless and versatile mortal. He acted as clerk of the chancery, and had, as a qualification, taken the oath of allegiance to the King. On that account he refused to bear arms against the government of England, and was in consequence denounced as a Tory: his paper was said to be under British influence, and, as Isaiah Thomas quaintly observes in his *History of Printing in America*. "he was several times in the hands of the *people*." He does not seem, however, to have been without friends on the Whig side, and Thomas goes on to say that one of them was Dr. Rittenhouse, "a literary character, well known in our country." One Benjamin Towne, the publisher of a rival paper, who seems moreover to have been under financial obligations to Humphreys, attacked him virulently in print, and Humphreys fearful of the result, discontinued his paper, and quitting business went into the country, where he remained until the British army approached Philadelphia, and then returned. When the troops went to New York he went with them, and occupied himself there as a merchant, until peace was concluded.

He then went to England where he procured a supply of good printing materials, and after some little time re-crossed the ocean, this time settling in Shelburne, Nova Scotia, where he established a newspaper called the *Nova Scotia Packet*. Not meeting with any great degree of encouragement, the *Packet* was discontinued, and he closed his printing-house, and employed himself as a merchant in Shelburne, until losses by French privateers induced him in 1797 to give up the business and return to Philadelphia, where he again opened a printing-house. We glean from the perusal of the daily press of the period that Humphreys, in partnership with one Peter Lohra, established a notary's office, advertising as a special attraction that ladies, having papers to execute, might by sending word to the office, "be waited

on at their respective houses." Besides books he dealt in stationery, making a specialty of quills, and once he advertises a line of "good hair trunks," a droll prophecy of modern departmental methods of book-selling.

Restlessness must always have been one of his characteristics, for in the space of three years after his return to Philadelphia, he moved his printing-house three times and his notary's office twice. He was considered a good and accurate printer, and seems to have taken pains to have the best materials obtainable. Thomas says of him, he "possessed a candid mind, and was apparently guided by moral principle." After this eulogy it is somewhat of a shock to find his name signed to the advertisement of a lottery, and that, too, the very month in which he died. But the newspapers of that day listed lotteries with other stocks and bonds, so perhaps minds were then too simple to grasp our latter-day, fine-spun distinctions.

On his death in 1810 his sons succeeded to the business, but relinquished it in 1812, disposing of the stock at auction. The result might have been different had it fallen into the hands of his daughters, for several of them were good compositors and often worked at the case.

Now, to turn from the editor to his edition, we have a volume of duodecimo size, the paper a little larger than that of its London prototype. I have seen three copies, one of which has the imprint "Printed and sold by James Humphreys," and the other two trade copies, differing from the first only in having the imprint "Printed by James Humphreys for Joseph Groff." All three copies have been rebound, the first in two separate volumes. In the Advertisement the editor offers an explanation of the delay in the publication of the poems, and also "presents his thanks to those who have been pleased to favour them with their encouragement by subscription." He proceeds:

"So rapid appears to have been the Sale of these Poems in London after the Publication of the Second Volume the last summer, that another Edition has been already since published. This, containing the following lengthy Preface, the beautiful Ode to Love, and some additional explanatory Notes, more than the former Edition, did not reach this Country till after the present one had been put to Press, and the First Volume nearly finished."

He adds that although the complete work was attended by more expense than he had calculated upon, it would be delivered to subscribers at the rate agreed upon when but one volume was intended.

From this it would appear that Humphreys was under the impression that a second volume had been issued separately in the summer of 1801, and that subsequently another and complete edition, of which the issue of 1798 formed the first volume, had been published. Now, as is perfectly well known, after the anonymous publication of *Lyrical Ballads* in September, 1798, there was no republication until the issue of two volumes dated 1800, but not actually published until January, 1801. Of these, the first volume consisted of a different arrangement of the poems of 1798 with some alterations, noticeably in the text of the *Ancient Mariner*, the *Convict* being omitted and Wordsworth's Preface and Coleridge's poem *Love* added. Humphreys concludes the Advertisement by mendaciously assuring his subscribers that

"the only difference that now exists between this and the last London Edition is, that the poem entitled the *Convict* is retained in this edition, but omitted in that, and that the arrangement of the Poems in the *First Volume* somewhat differs. The reader, however, by turning to them as they follow in the preceding Table of Contents, will have them as they are arranged in the last London Edition."

Examination shows that Volume 1 was undoubtedly printed from the edition of 1798, and therefore differs materially from the "London Second Edition." It is evident that when the edition of 1800 came to hand the preface, the revised contents, and the poem *Love* were printed and inserted before the *Ancient Mariner*, *Love* ending on page 5, on the back of which is the half-title 'The Ancient Mariner, A Poet's Reverie,' from the altered title of 1800, as is also the Argument which follows on the same page. The poem begins on what should have been page 7, and has the heading and spelling of 1798—"The Rime of the Ancyent Marinere. In Seven Parts." But on turning over the leaf we find the next page numbered 14. A full collation of this volume with technical details is given by the late J. Dykes Campbell in the *Athenæum* of February 17, 1894.

An examination of the text would indicate

that Humphreys was in fact, as well as in name, an editor of the ballads. Aside from differences that are possibly misprints, such as "pity pleasing" for "pity-pleading" in *The Nightingale*, l. 39, and casual variations in spelling, as "chearful" and "cheerful," used in both editions with complete indifference, there are actual alterations in the text and considerable differences in punctuation. One of the most noticeable of the latter is in the use of quotation marks where there are two speakers, the words of one being enclosed in double, and those of the other in single quotations. This rule obtains all through the *Ancient Mariner* and many of the other poems in both volumes, but is by no means slavishly followed. Additional punctuation is, as a rule, used with a view to bringing out the meaning. This may be illustrated by two lines from the *Ancient Mariner*.

London Edition.

Quoth he the man hath penance done,
And penance more will do.

Philadelphia Edition.

"Quoth he, "The man hath penance done,
"And penance more will do."

It must be owned, though, that commas are often omitted or inserted without discernible reason. The change of colon to semi-colon, and the reverse, is frequent, and apparently indifferent. The interrogation point is substituted in several instances for the comma or exclamation point. *Hart-Leap Well*, l. 51.

Are but three bounds, and look, Sir, at this last?

Exclamation points and italicized words are used far more freely than in the London volumes, this is especially true of Volume II, for example, the last line of *Hart-Leap Well*.

"With Sorrow of the meanest thing that feels."

In the second volume there are no less than thirty instances of the substitution of the exclamation point for comma, semi-colon, colon, or period. More words are capitalized in the Philadelphia edition, though there is no discernible rule in the matter: it is, however, a curious point that "cross" and "crucifix" are capitalized wherever they occur, while in the London edition they are spelled with a small letter except once in the *Ancient Mariner*. Hyphens are used or omitted indifferently, though possibly they are more numerous in the Philadelphia edition. A noticeable difference is in the use of paren-

thesis for commas in setting off explanatory clauses. These statements, it must be remembered, are very general, and it is not difficult to find instances where the rule is exactly reversed. The fact that there are fewer alterations in punctuation in the first volume than in the second is very marked. Possibly Humphreys got his editorial hand fairly in by the time the edition of 1800 arrived.

Coming back to the text we find, in the Argument to the *Ancient Mariner*, which, it must be remembered is reprinted from that of 1800, that "a Ship having passed the Line" is altered by Humphreys to "having sailed to the Equator." Did he consider that "Line" smacked too much of the fo'castle? "Calendar" is spelled "Kalendar" in *Lines written at a small distance*, and in l. 89 of the *Idiot Boy* we have,

The green bough motionless and dead

for

The green bough's motionless and dead.

Another alteration, apparently purely arbitrary, is the doubling the length of the stanzas in *Goody Blake and Harry Gill* and printing without division into stanzas the *Lines (written near Richmond)*. The list of *errata* in the edition of 1798 is not reprinted, and it might fairly be supposed that they had been corrected in the text, but as a matter of fact this is true but of two of them.

In the text of Volume II the greater activity of the editor is as evident as in the matter of punctuation. The misspelling "Theives" in the *Contents* is corrected, and "houshold" in *The Fountain* as well as "falshood" in *A Poet's Epitaph* is supplied with the missing letter. In *Hart-Leap Well*, pt. II, l. 24,

And what this place might be I then inquir'd

becomes:

And what this place might be of him inquir'd.—

an emendation peculiar to Humphreys.

Two obvious misprints, "horsemen" for "horsman" in l. 10, *Hart-Leap Well* and "house cloth" for "house clock" in l. 158, *The Brothers* are corrected, but an equally noticeable blunder, "On" for "In" in l. 17, *The Fountain* is left unchanged, as is also "unborn" for "unshorn" in the *Inscription (Rude is this edifice)*. In *Ellen Irwin* the javelin is launched "at Bruce's heart," a phraseology more in accordance with the fact of its having been intercepted by that devoted damsel than the

original "to Bruce's heart," which was retained until 1837, but in the edition of that year became "at."¹ This regard for plain fact appears again in the alteration of the opening line of *Nutting* to "It seem'd a day." The correction of but two of the London list of these *errata* has been attempted, with a curious result in one instance: ll. 5, *The Childless Father* read originally,

Of coats and of jackets, both grey, red, and green,
corrected in the *errata* to "jackets grey, scarlet,
and green." But the Philadelphia edition retains "both" and substitutes "scarlet" for "red" thereby producing the lame line.

Of coats and of jackets both grey, scarlet, and green.

It is known that during the year 1801 a long *errata* list was issued by Wordsworth, who was disgusted with the many errors of volume ii. It consisted of a half-sheet containing twenty-seven *errata*, together with a cancel sheet with the missing lines in *Michael*. So far only three copies of this are known to exist, all stuck in copies of the edition of 1800. The question at once arises: Does Humphreys deserve credit for his emendations, or did he see this list? Certainly he did not see it in time to insert the missing lines in *Michael*, for their absence is indicated by a break. The courtesy of Mr. Thomas Hutchinson of Dublin furnished me with a copy of this list, and as only two of the corrections correspond with those of Humphreys, it seems safe to say that he never saw it.

Busy, versatile James Humphreys! One can but wonder that he made the corrections he did, and yet left so many obvious blunders untouched, but for all that is he not entitled to stand first, in point of time at least, in the long line of those whose loving labor it has been to edit the text of Wordsworth?

J. Dykes Campbell in the article mentioned above raises the question as to whether Wordsworth was aware of this early American appreciation of his poetry. He says, "I do not remember to have met with any indication in the published correspondence of either Wordsworth or Coleridge of their having become aware that the 'Lyrical Ballads' had been reprinted—an event which if it had been heard of at the time would have cheered them, and interested them not a little had the news reached them in later years."

This last pleasure at least was Wordsworth's,

for Henry Reed, in a note at the end of the chapter on *Lyrical Ballads* in his edition of C. Wordsworth's *Memoirs*, after making brief mention of Humphreys' edition says that Wordsworth

"never saw a copy of the early American edition of his first poems until 1839, when a copy was forwarded to him by a friend in Philadelphia."

This positive and unhesitating assertion prompts the suspicion that the anonymous friend may have been no other than that ill-fated prophet of Wordsworth, Prof. Reed himself.

L. A. FISHER.

Philadelphia.

A DETAIL OF RENAISSANCE CRITICISM.

SIR JOHN HARRINGTON in "An Apologie of Poetrie" prefixed to his translation of *Orlando Furioso* (1591) cites Cornelius Agrippa's¹ four objections to the art of poetry: "That is a nurse of lies, a pleaser of fools, a breeder of dangerous errors, and an enticer to wantonnes." In answering the "first of lying" he draws from a source, which, I believe, has not yet been noticed—Leon Hebreo (Judas Abravanel or Abarbanel): *Los Diálogos de amor*.

*The Dialogues of Love*² was at that time a widely read book throughout Europe. Frequent editions had appeared, and translations had been made into Latin, Hebrew, Spanish, and French, since the original Italian publication at Rome, 1535. Earlier even, a translation into French by Pontus de Thiard had been printed at Lyons. The date of this is 1515, and the subsequent French translation, by Denys Sauvage was also printed at Lyons, in 1558. There were altogether perhaps twenty editions.

Abravanel, the Spanish author, composed his work at Genoa in 1502, under the inspiration chiefly of Italian admirers of Plato. He was the personal friend of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, and he represents the last influence of that religion which Gemistos Plethon had attempted to introduce from Greece into Italy by his revival of Neo-Platonism. He is not of course an enthusiast of the Florentine Acad-

¹ *De vanitate scientiarum* cap. 4.

² Accounts of the book and author may be found in Menéndez y Pelayo and *Le Grand Encyclop. dic.* There is no biography.

emy, where Ficino burned a lamp before Plato's shrine, and where Pico proposed to harmonize all philosophies and religions. But he reveres "il divin Platon" above all other philosophers, he advocates the theory of Platonic love, and imitates in his dialogues the Platonic form.

Judas Abravanel was born at Lisbon and lived subsequently at Toledo and at Naples, following the fortunes of his father, Isaac.³ Isaac was the financier of Alphonse V. of Portugal, of Ferdinand the Catholic, Ferdinand I of Sicily, and his son Alphonse. In later life he served the republic of Venice. From him, probably, Judas derived a taste for philosophic thought, for Isaac wrote twenty books of biblical commentaries. The son was physician to Gonsalvo de Córdoba. He wrote another philosophic book, *Coeli Armonia*, and some poems in Hebrew.

The Dialogues were written in good Italian. The grace and profundity of their thought, and the piety which made many readers refuse to believe that Abravanel remained of the Jewish faith, invested the book with considerable moral influence. It was just the book which Harington, in defending poetry against attacks from the Church, would like to have on his side.

The interlocutors, Philon and Sophia, discourse upon (1) the essence of love, (2) the universality of love, (3) the origin of love. When, in the second dialogue, Sophia speaks of "that which the poets feign concerning the love of the gods," and asks if it be not "vain and mendacious," Philon replies:⁴

"Los poetas antiguos no una sola, mas muchas intenciones implicaron en sus poemas, los quales ihaman sentidos, ponen primero de todos para el sentido literal, como caxca de tuera, la istoria de algunas personas, y de sus hechos notables dinos de memoria, despues en aquella misma fincion ponen como mas intrinseca caxca, mas allegado al meollo, el sentido moral, until a la vida activa de los hombres aprobando los autos virtuosos, y vituperando los viciosos, allende desto debaxo de aquellas proprias palabras sinifican alguna verdadero enteligencia, de las cosas naturales, o celestes astrologos, o theologales, y alguna vez las dos, o todos los tres sentidos scientificos se incluyen dentro dela fincion. Como los meollos del fruto dentro

³ Cf. Moïse Schwar, *A. et son époque*, p. 1865.
⁴ *Los Dialogos de amor*. Venice, 1568, p. 287. This is the only edition I could consult; I am inclined to think Harington did not use it.

en sus caxcas. Estos sentidos meolladas se lhaman alegoricos."

This favorite Mediæval and Renaissance defense of the poet's story for the sake of his moral allegory, Sir John Harington copies almost word for word:

"The ancient Poets have indeed wrapped as it were in their writings divers and sundry meanings, which they call the sences or mysteries thereof. First of all for the literall sence (as it were the utmost barke or ryne) they set down in manner of an historie, the acts and notable exploits of some persons worthy memorie; then in the same fiction, as a second rine and somewhat more fine, as it was nearer to the pith and marrow, they place the Morall sence, profitable for the active life of man, approving vertuous actions and condemning the contrarie. Manie times also under the selfesame words they comprehended some true understanding of naturall Philosophie, or sometimes of politike government, and now and then of divinitie: and these same sences that comprehend so excellent knowledge we call the Allegorie, which Plutarch⁶ defineth to be when one thing is told and by that another understood."

Harington's substitution of "politike government" for "celestes astrologos" was probably necessary in order to avoid awakening English prejudice; just as later, when he wishes to praise Bishop Fisher—a Catholic prelate under Henry VIII, he feels compelled to add: "though I do not praise his religion." Similarly, to suit his purpose, Harington transforms the dialogue into straightforward discourse. When Sophia replies to Philon:

"No pequeno artificio, ni deflaco ingenho me parece comprender en una naracion istorial, verdadera o fingida tantas y tan diversas y altas sentencias, Querria di te algun breve exemplo para que me pueda fer mas creible."

Harington's version reads:

"Now let any man judge if it be a matter of meane art or wit to containe in one historicall narration either true or fained, so many, so diverse, and so deepe conceits: but for making the matter more plaine I will allege an example thereof."

He then repeats in somewhat loose translation the story of Perseus slaying the dragon, and being on that account exalted to Heaven. This story, we are told, is an image of virtue slaying vice, of man's mind vanquishing earthliness, and of the heavenly nature, which,

⁵ Joseph Haslewood: *The Arts of English Poetrie*, etc. ii, 127.

⁶ The reference to Plutarch is not in Leon, and probably comes from Sidney.

"severing itself from our earthly bodies flew up on high and there remaineth forever."

All these meanings excited in Sophia wonder and admiration; but, she questions, "why did the poets not make known their doctrines more openly?" Philon answers with five reasons. They desired in the first place, he says, to secrete their knowledge from "profane wits" (as Harington translates), "in whom science is corrupted, like good wine in bad vessels." Then they wished to further by the use of *matre* "the conservation of the memorie of their precepts." The third and the fourth reasons—not translated by Harington—are: "para mesclar lo deleitable historial y fabuloso, con el verdadero entelektual, y lo facil con lo dificil," and "por la conservacion de las cosas entelektuales que no se vengán a variar in proceso de tiempo en las diversas mentes de los hombres." The last and foremost ("ultima y primera") is "por que con un misma magar pudiesen dar comida a diversas conbidados de diversos sabores" (with one kind of meat and one dish to feed diverse tastes).

The omission by Harington of the third and fourth reasons, and also of a short passage just after turning the leaf, are unaccountable to me, except upon the supposition that a corner of that leaf in his copy had been torn off. This the position of the passages makes possible—although not in the 1568 edition. The arguments—the desirability of mixing pleasure with profit, and of preserving tradition unchanged—are both unobjectionable and effective.

As a cap to his argument in defense of the truthfulness of poetry, Harington repeats after Abravanel an old amusing error of Renaissance champions of poetry, Plato had banished poets from his Republic, and to them this was a constant ear sore; for they placed Plato himself among the poets. They replied, as a rule, that Plato meant nothing of the sort,⁷ and this final parallel between the English critic and his original, presents a covert and novel answer to the moralists' rebuke. Although neither author mentions the Republic, and Abravanel is concerned to justify not poetry, but the Platonic form of writing; nevertheless Harington clearly attempts to defend poetry against Plato's attack. He has in mind no doubt the passage of Sidney's *Defence of Poetrie*, where,

⁷ I have a thesis on this subject in course of preparation.

after some argument, this conclusion is reached: that poetry was "not banished, but honored by Plato."

"Soph. Me agradan todan estas causas de los fingamentos poeticos. Mas dime, Platon y Aristotiles principes de los philosophos porque uno dellos no quiso (y sibien uso la fabula) usar el verso, mas solamente la prosa, y el otro ni verso ni fabula uso, mas oracion disciplinal.

Phil. No rompen las leis los pequenhos, mas solamente los grandes, El divino Platon queriendo a largar la sciencia, saco della una ceradura, la del verso, mas no la otra de la fabula, ansi que el fue el primero que rompio parte de la lei de la conservacion de la sciencia mas en tal modo la dexo cerada conel estilo fabuloso que abasto para la conservar. Aristotiles mas osado y cobdicioso de acrecentar con nuevo y propio modo, y estilo nel dizil quiso tambien arancar la ceradura de la fabula, y romper del todo la lei conservativa, y hablo en estil scientifico en prosa las cosas de la filosofia: Es bien verdad que uso tan maravilloso artificio en el dizir tanto breve, tanto comprensivo, y tanta de profunda sinificacion, que aquello abasto para conservacion de las sciencias en lugar de verso y de fabula tanto que respondiendo el a Alexandro Macedonia fu disipolo, el qual le avia escrito que se maravillava que unise manifestado los libros tan secretos dela sacra Filosofia. Le respondio, que sus libros eran editos, y no editos, Editos solamente a aquellos que dellos han entendidos destas palabras notarlas o sophia la dificultad y artificio que ay nel hablar de Aristotiles."

Harington, in adapting this passage to the defense of poetry, rather stupidly retains the name of Aristotle, whose authority, far from being inimical, is that on which all books concerning the Art of Poetry rely. For the rest, where he diverges from Abravanel, he follows Sir Philip Sidney.

"Now though I know that the example and authority of Aristotle and Plato may still be urged against this [writing poetry], who tooke to themselves another manner of writing: first I may say indeed that lawes were made for poor men, and not for Princes, for these two great Princes of Philosophie, brake that former allowed manner of writing, yet Plato still preserved the fable, but refused the verse. Aristotle though rejecting both, yet retained still a kind of obscuritie, in so much he answered Alexander, who reproved him in a sort, for publishing the sacred secrets of Philosophie, that he had set forth his books in a sort, and yet not set them forth; meaning that they were so obscure that they would be understood of few, except they came to him for instructions: or else without

they were of very good capacite and studious of Philosophie. But (as I say) Plato howsoever men would make him an enemy of poetrie (because he found indeed just fault with the abuses of some comical Poets of his time, or some that sought to set up new and strange religions) yet you see he kept still that principall part of Poetrie, which is fiction and imitation: and as for the other part of Poetrie which is verse, though he used it not, yet his master Socrates even in his old age wrote certain verses, as Plutarch testifieth:"

Therefore, Harington concludes, poetry is not "a nurse of lies." I am afraid Abravanel led him rather far astray.

PERCY W. LONG.

Harvard University.

SOME NOTES ON BOIARDO'S VER- SION OF THE ALEXANDER- SAGAS.

THE first canto of the second part of the *Orlando Innamorato* contains a description of the magnificent palace of Agramante, the alleged descendant of Alexander. In this palace is a great series of paintings representing the whole life of the great Macedonian conqueror (20-21). It is really nothing more than an epitome of the legends of Alexander which became so popular after the Crusades. But in this epitome some legends are found which do not appear in many of the French versions,¹ but do occur in the English *Kyng Alisaunder*.² On the other hand, Boiardo agrees with the French romances on some points that are not to be found in the English *Kyng Alisaunder*, which, however, follows very closely the French work of Thomas of Kent (*L'Histoire de toute Chevalerie*), as do all the English romances on this subject. But Thomas of Kent must have followed different sources than the French poets on the continent, although these sources still remain to be investigated and established.

Boiardo says that the Macedonian conqueror founded Alexandria as a monument of his love to Elidonia (st. 5):

E per amor ch'egli ebbe a sua beltade
Sopra il mar fece una ricca cittade.

In *Li Romans d'Alixandre* the conqueror is said to have founded twelve cities in commem-

¹ Alberic de Besançon, the Venetian and Arsenal manuscripts, the manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and of the Bibliothèque Impériale, and *Li Romans d'Alixandre* by Alexander de Bernay and Lambert le Tort.

² A poem of the first half of the fourteenth century. Edited by Henry Weber in his *Metrical Romances*, vol. 1, Edinburgh, 1810.

oration of his victories. See Michelant's edition,³ p. 547, line 56:

Après fist il .i. autre que sor .i. mont leva,
Et .i. autre Alixandre là ù Porru tua.
.....
Et le gent Alixandre qu'en Egypte estora,
Et cele fu li miudre et que il plus ama.

In *Kyng Alisaunder* he is said to have built only one (7151):

Withynne the walles he made houses,
and made the stretes mervylouse.

.....
And gaf thetoun a name of prys,
Alisaunder, after himseolf y-wis.

Boiardo seems to have been the first to have assigned the motive of love to Elidonia as the reason for the founding of Alexandria. The editor of the *Orlando Innamorato*, Panizzi, claimed that the whole story of Alexander's love for Elidonia was an invention of the poet in order to explain the ancestry of Agramante.⁴ In the Arsenal manuscript, however, we find a somewhat similar story (see P. Meyer, vol. 1, p. 101, v. 21):

Sa muler Rosenès lo curut à embracer.
Que les olz e la boce li commence à baisier.
Sire, dreit enperere, vous me tu donc laiser.
E gerpir en ces segle tant chaitive moller?
Je soi grosse e enceinte, si ne me pois aider,
Reis tu (?) ors me deuses amer e conseller.

Apart from the name these lines resemble very closely the first four in stanza seven of our poem:

Stava in Egitto allora la fantina,
Che fu nominata Elidonia la bella,
Gravida di sei mesi la meschina,
Quando sentitte la trista novella.

The Rosenès of the French poem is said to have had a maid named Lioine (Meyer, p. 99, v. 46), and it is possible that Boiardo might have derived the name of the mistress from that of the servant for reasons of euphony, or of versification. But Boiardo's continuation of the story seems to be his own, as Rosenès is not credited with any of the adventures which befell Elidonia.

Boiardo disagrees with most of the French poets in his account of the birth of Alexander (see *Orl. Inn.*, ii, i, St. 22):

Lì si vedea l'astrologio prudente,
Qual del suo regno se n'era fuggito,

³ All quotations out of the French romances will be made either from Michelant's edition of *Li Romans d'Alixandre*, by Alexander de Bernay and Lambert le Tort, or from the first volume of Paul Meyer's *Alexandre dans la Littérature du Moyen Âge*.

⁴ Note to stanza 30, vol. iv, p. 344.

Che una regina in forma di serpente
Avea gabbata, e prese il suo appetito.

The manner in which the astrologer (Nectanebus) betrayed (*gabbata*) the queen is fully described in *Kyng Alisaunder*, v. 384-392:

Neptanabus his charme hath ynome,
And takith him haums of a dragon,
From his scholdron, to his hele adoun,
His heved, and his scholdron fram,
He dyghte in forme of a ram.
On hire bed twyes he leped;
The thriddle tyme yn he creped,
Of he caste his dragouns hame,
And with the lady plaied a game.⁵

In the work of Alexander de Bernay and Lambert le Tort, it appears that the poets were familiar with this story and not disposed to question the truth of it very vigorously (see Michelant, p. 5):

Quar li plusior disoient, sens nule legerie,
Que Alixandres est nés de bastarderie;
Car è l'tans k'il fut nés, si com la letre die,
Ert .i. clers de' pais, plains de grande voidie,
Natabus ot anon en la langhe arrabie.
Al'nestre aida l'enfant, coi que uns li en die.

But old Alberic de Besançon denies all allegations against the legitimacy of his hero's birth most indignantly (see P. Meyer, p. 27):

Dicunt alquant estrobatour
Quel reys fud filz d'encantatour;
Mentent fellon losen getour;
Mal en credreyz nec un de lour,
Qu'anz fud de ling d'emperatour.
Et filz al rey Macedonor.

The manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale denies this tradition with equal boldness (see Meyer, p. 120, v. 135-141):

A icel tans en furent les gens espoentés,
Et dirent d'Alixandre ke fut engenrés
D'un maistre encantaour en dragon figurés.
Mais iche fu mençoigne, ne fu pas verités,
Car asès fu par lui l'affaires esproves,
Car ne fu uns t's ber ne de tés qualités.
Fix fu au roi Phelippe ki moult fu honerés.

The Arsenal and Venetian manuscripts also maintains with equal vigor the legitimacy of Alexander's.

The description of the steed Bucephalus varies according to the imagination of the different poets, Boiardo says that he has horns on his head (see St. 22):

E come dentro ad una gran foresta,
Prese un destrier ch'avea le corna in testa.
Buccifal avea nome quel ronzone (St. 23).

The horse is variously described in the French versions as follows.

⁵ This story is found told in almost the same words in Thomas of Kent's *Histoire de toute Chevalerie*, Verses 489-499.

Li Romans d'Alixandre, p. ii, v. 29.

Si a teste de bouc et s'a ious de lion,
Et s'a ous de cheval, s'a Bucifal à nom.

Arsenal manuscript, v. 102:

Dist Tolomés escolta ma raison;
D'un tel cheval poez oïr lo son
Qui plus est fers que t'gres ne lion.
Grant a la gole, de denz sembla dragon.

Thomas of Kent, v. 489:

E por ceo fu nomé le cheval Bucifal;
Une corroune ot el front com(e) ceo fut de roal,
E teste aveit de tor e jubé bestial.

Strangely enough *Kyng Alisaunder* contains the description which resembles Boiardo's most closely, v. 684:

A grisly best, a ragged colt,
They had hit caught in the holt
His heved, so a bole smert;
An horn the forked amyward,
That wolde perce scheldis hard.

The description of Alexander's conquest of the world is essentially the same in all the Alexander romances, as is also the story of his victory over Porrus (st. 26). The account of the punishment of the traitor Basso (st. 24) is also found in most of the romances with a difference in names. In *Li Romans d'Alixandre* two traitors were put to death, but the name of only one is given (see Michelant, p. 256, v. 33):

Et Balans ses compains qui lés lui cevaucioit,
Ambedoi li glouton estoient d'un complot.

But in *Kyng Alisaunder* the poet is more explicit and gives the names of both malefactors. They were Besanas and Besas (v. 4724); the last name looks very much like Boiardo's Basso.

In stanza 25 we find an episode which does not occur in most of these romances, that is, his swimming the Ganges (see st. 25).

E poi si vede in India travargato,
Notando il Gange che è sì gran fiumana.

In *Li Romans d'Alixandre*, Alexander is said to have swum in a river for pleasure one warm day and to have nearly died from the effects thereof (Michelant, p. 66), but that is the nearest approach to Boiardo's account that is found in any of the continental French versions. But in *Kyng Alisaunder* there is an account of his swimming over a river called the Estrage (see, v. 4259):

Alisaunder hath theo water caught,
Hit was brod and hight Estrage;
Deope stremes and savage.
He smot his hors and in he leop;
Hit was swithe brod and deop.

Hors and kyng, with alle hater,
Was aunted undur the water.
Alisaunder to-fore no seoth;
He was sore adred of deth.
Notheles, his hors was god,
And keovered up above the fiod;
And swam to that othir syde
There his knyghtis him dude abyde.

The same stanza (25) contains the account of his fight in the city:

Dentro a una terra soletto e serrato,
Et ha d'intorno la gente villana;
Ma lui ruina il muro in ogni lato
Sopra nemici, e quella terra spiana.

None of the French romances which have been published contain any account of this heroic exploit. *Kyng Alisaunder*, however, describes a fight which Alexander had within the walls of an armed town, which resembles quite closely this story of Boiardo's (see *Kyng Alisaunder*, v. 5826):

The Kyng off his stede alighth,
And steegh on the wal anon righth,
And looked oner what hy dede.
Hy weren redy in that stede,
As I fynde on the boke,
And plighen hym with yrlen hoke;
And laiden hym on with swerd anf batt
The kyng was nigh all to-flatt,
Er he west where he was.
The kyng rekowered natheles,
Under shelde he gan hym were,
And wel swiftly hym bistere;
Smoot and leide on with mayn,
And slough a rawe two duzeyn;
And maugre the teeth of them alle,
Sette his rigge to the walle.
That folk grete assaught him gaue,
With swerdes, axes, stones and staue,
Woundeden, felden, and sore hym herten
His woundes bledden, his dyntes smerten,
That he grented as a bore,
And dede many a dynt sore; etc.

Finally his army comes and breaks down the walls of the town, rescues him, and slaughters the people.

On the other hand, the ascent of Alexander into the heavens by means of a car borne by griffons, is not to be found in *Kyng Alisaunder*, but is very completely described in the manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, v. 409:

Les .ii. gripons demande, ses a fait amener,
Parmi les cors les fait loier et atourner,
Et par desous les eles, nes vaut pas encombrer.
Puis prent .ii. lons espois, ses commande à doler,
Il. capons i fist metre ke il ot fait plumer.
El chief de le coraie fist les espois bouter;
Aparellier les fist k'il les peüst tourner,
Quel part ke il vauisist on baissier ou lever:
Mist soi en la kaiere, si se fist bien serrer;

Le car monstre as gripons qui les faisoit haster;
Por le viande ataindre commencent à voler.

.....
Alixandre est si haut nel pueent mais coisir
Au ciel cuidoit ataindre, mais n'i pot avenir.

In *Li Romans d'Alixandre* the car is said to have been borne by four griffons: compare with the *Orlando Innamorato*, st. 28:

Poscia che fu la terra da lui vinta,
A due Grifon nel ciel si fe' portare,

Alexander was also supposed to have descended into the sea (see st. 28):

Poi dentro un vetro si cala nel mare,
E vide le balene e ogni gran pesce,
E campa e ancor quivi di fuora n'esce.

In the French practically the same story is found (see P. Meyer, p. 134, v. 484):

Ofr poés comment il servi par un jour
En le grant mer parfonde, dont li siecle a paor,
En .i. petit vaissel ke ot fait à labor
D' .i. voirre tresgeté à .i. engingneur.

.....
Quec puet Alixandre les poissons esgarder
Dont moult vir entour lui et venir et aler,
As fors prendre les foibles, mangier et estrangier.

The English romance seems to have come from different sources, or to have received some additions (see *Kyng Alisaunder*, v. 6170):

A lond ther is, bytweone Egipte and Ynde,
(In maistris bokes as we fyndith)
In an yle of water they wonith;
Queytance of al men they schoneth;
For they wonith in water y-wis,
With eker and with fysch.
.....
This yle is yhote Neopante.
The kyng thider message sente,
And so shedde with his mede,
That he hadde heore bel awrede
Theo kyng was of hardy blod
With heom he wente undur the fiod
He saw the ekeris wronginge,
How everich other mette
And the more the lasse frette.

The story of Alexander's death at the hands of his physician Antipater or Antipatro (st. 29) is practically the same in all these romances of Alexander.

These few stanzas of Boiardo summarize quite completely all the legends contained in all the French Romances which have been published, as well as the English version based on the *Roman de toute Chevalerie* by Thomas of Kent. There is one episode which is not related in any of them; namely the combat between Alexander and the basilisk (St. 27):

Eravi ancora come il basilischio
Stava nel passo sopra una montagna,
E spaventava ciascun sol col suo fischio,
E la con la vista la gente magagna.

Come Alessandro lui si pose a rischio,
Per quella gente ch'era a la campagna,
E per consiglio di quel sapiente,
Col specchio al scudo, uccise quel serpente.

This may, however, be only an adaptation of the Perseus-Medusa legend.

We do not know from what sources Boiardo took the matter for these verses; but the great brevity with which he refers to the different legends indicates that he pre-supposed a familiarity with them on the part of his audience. The *Historia de Proeliis* (see below) was put in Italian verse by Qualichius di Spoleto as early as the thirteenth century. It is very probable that these stories of the marvelous deeds of Alexander had been sung or recited on the squares before the people for a long time, as were so many of the old poems, of an epic character.⁶ At all events these stanzas of Boiardo show that at the time in which he wrote, that is, towards the end of the fifteenth century, the Alexander legends were well known in Italy. This would be a slight proof in favor of the view that the Alexander sagas came to France and the northern countries through Italy, as opposed to those who believe the Italian Alexander romances to be mere translations from the Old French, a view which was taken by Grimm but called into doubt by Gaspary in his *Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur*. P. Meyer speaks very decidedly on this question (see *Alexandre dans la Littérature du Moyen Âge*, vol. ii, pp. 38-39):

"Le Ms. de Bamberg a joué un rôle important dans la transmission de *L'Historia de Proeliis* (also called *Historia Alexandri Magni Regis Macedoniæ de Proeliis*). Non seulement c'est le plus ancien exemplaire connu de cette version de Pseudo-Callisthenes, mais il se pourrait bien être qu'il fût le premier qui ait été porté hors d'Italie. Elle (*Historia de Proeliis*) a dû nous parvenir directement d'Italie et par des Mss. qui déjà avaient perdu le prologue, si heureusement conservé par les Mss. de Bamberg et Munich."

COLBERT SEARLES.

Indiana State University.

ETYMOLOGIES.

1. OE. *banca*, ON. *bakki* 'bank,' OE. *benc*, OS., OHG. *bank*, ON. *bekkr* 'bench' may be referred to the root *bhe(n)g-* 'break' in Skt. *bhanákti* 'break,' *bhagna-* 'broken,' Ir. *bongaim* 'break,' OSw. *banka* 'strike,' etc. (Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* s. v. *bhanákti*.) To these we

⁶ See Gröber's *Grundriss*, ii, 3, p. 34.

may add Lith. *bengù* 'end,' primarily 'break off.'

The root *bhe(n)g-* 'break' meant perhaps originally 'cause to fly off,' in which case it may be compared with the root *bhēg-* 'flee, run' in Gk. *φείσθαι* 'flee, be frightened,' Lith. *bēgu* 'flee, run, flow,' etc. With this compare OHG. *bah(h)*, OS. *beki*; ON. *bekkr* 'brook,' etc.

2. To the usual comparisons made with Goth. *brikan* 'break,' Lat. *frangō*, etc., we may add Lith. *brėziū* 'scratch,' base **bhrē-g-*, or OChSl. *brěgŭ* 'slope, bank,' base **bhrē-g-*. Or both may be related through the root *bher-*, *bhrē-*. Cf. Persson, *Wurzelerweiterung*, 18.

3. Germ. *brūdi-* 'bride' has been explained as an abstract formation to Av. *mraomī*, Skt. *bravimī* 'speak.' The pre-Germ. form is supposed to have been **mrūti-*. So Uhlenbeck, *PBB.*, xxii, 188; Hirt, *PBB.*, xxii, 234. This explanation is quite satisfactory, and yet I wish to suggest another possibility. Pre-Germ. **mrūti-* may be a secondary lengthening from **mruti-* < **mr̥ti-*. This may be compared with Gk. Cret. *μαῖρις* 'virgin,' Lith. *martis* 'bride.' This connection gains probability from the fact that this word for 'bride' is contained in Crimean Goth. *marzus*. Cf. Loewe, *IF. Anz.* ix, 198.

4. Germ. *fiska-* 'fish' has not been satisfactorily explained, since no certain connection has been found outside of Lat. *piscis* and Ir. *iasc* 'fish.' The base **pi-sqo-* may have meant 'water-animal.' Compare the stem **(p)isqā-* in OBrit. *Ἰσκα*, Ir. *esc* 'water.' This is probably from the root *pi-* 'flow.' Cf. Fick, *Wb.* ii, 329.

5. With Goth. *bi-gitan* 'find, get,' ON. *geta* 'get, obtain, guess,' etc., compare, in addition to the words usually given, Lith. *godau*, -*dyti*, *godoju*, -*doti* 'guess, suppose,' *gōdas*, *gūdas* 'avarice' and also the name of a bur, that is, 'grasper,' *gūdūs* 'grasping, avaricious,' *godūs* 'greedy,' and perhaps *gendū*, *gesti* 'miss,' that is, 'want, desire, strive to get,' *gedū* 'mourn for.' On the connection of E. *guess* with *get*, cf. author, *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, xiv, 259.

6. The root **gheu-d-* 'pour' is supposed to be found only in Lat. *fundō* and Germ. **geutan* 'pour out,' Goth. *gintan*, etc. Compare, however, Lith. *žudaū* 'slay, kill' with Lat. *fundō* 'cast down, overwhelm, vanquish' and OE. *gietan* < **gauljan* 'destroy.' This last form is not mentioned by Kluge or Uhlenbeck in their *Et. Wbb.* The simple root **gheu-* is also in Lith. *žėwū*, *žūti* 'perish,' *žawinū* 'slay.'

7. Goth. *mandjan* 'remind' has been compared with OCh.Sl. *mysl* 'thought' and Ir. *smánaim* 'think' (Fick, *Wb.* ii, 317; Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.*). Add to these Gk. *μῦθος* 'word, speech, counsel, advice,' *μυθέομαι* 'say, speak, consider.'

8. Goth. *supōn*, OHG. *soffōn* 'season' are declared unexplained by Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* These words, however, have been connected with the Germ. root *sūp-* in E. *sip*, *sop*, *sup*, NHG. *suppe*, etc. Cf. Schade, *Wb.* s. v. *sophā*, *sophōn*. This is a natural connection and easily explained. The base **sū-bo-*, **sū-bā-* is undoubtedly, like **sū-go-* in OE. *sūcan* 'suck,' Lat. *sugō*, and **sū-go-* in OE. *sūgan* 'suck,' Lat. *sucus* 'juice,' etc. (cf. Persson, *Wurzelerweiterung*, 8 f.), from the root *sū-* 'flow.' The base **sūbo-*, therefore meant 'flowing, liquid, juicy,' from which developed the meaning 'good-tasting.' Hence Goth. *supōn*, OHG. *soffōn* 'season.' For this connection compare Skt. *rāsa* 'sap, fluid, water:' 'taste,' *rasati* 'taste of;' Gk. *χυλός*, *χυμός* 'juice, liquid:' 'flavor, taste,' *χυμώω* 'impart a taste or flavor.'

9. ON. *dāmr* 'taste, after-taste,' *dāma* 'taste, taste of' have a similar development. These come from a base **dhē-mo-* 'drinking,' root *dhē-* 'drink, suck' in Skt. *dhāyati* 'suck, drink,' Goth. *daddjan*, OHG. *tāan* 'suckle,' etc.

10. OE. *clūd*, ME. *cloud* 'a mass of rock, a hill:' ME. *cloude*, E. *cloud* is a comparison doubted by Kluge and Lutz, *Eng. Et.* And yet each could easily come from the common meaning 'mass, lump.' Compare Skt. *ghanā* 'mass, lump, heap:' 'cloud.' E. *cloud* may further be connected with E. *clod*, *clot*, NHG. *kloss*, *klotz*, etc., from the root *glu-* 'stick together, ball up.' We may, therefore, compare E. *cloud* and OE. *clūd* 'rock' with Gk. *γλουρός* 'rump' (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *γλουρός*).

11. E. *keep* seems not to occur in any other Germ. language, but it probably has other relatives in OE. besides *cēpan*. This word is defined by Sweet, *Dict. of AS.*: 'observe, notice; attend to, not neglect, keep; take (to flight), betake oneself (to shelter); devise, meditate.' These various significations may come from the common meaning 'turn, turn toward.' We may then connect OE. *cēpan* with OE. *capian* 'turn, face,' *ge-cōp* 'fit, suitable.'

12. OE. *falod*, *fald* 'fold, pen,' *faldian* 'make sheep-fold, hurdle off sheep' are connected by Skeat, *Et. Dict.*, with ON. *fföl* 'board.' More nearly related are ON. *faldr*

'fold, pen, trunk,' Dan. *fold* 'fold, pen.' These are derivatives of the Germ. stem *falō-* in ON. *fföl*, Dan. *ffæl*. They are perhaps further connected with Lat. *pālus* 'pole, stake.'

13. E. *rend*, OE. *rendan* 'tear, lacerate,' OFris. *renda* 'tear, break' are not traced outside of Germ. by Kluge and Lutz, *Eng. Et.* They are derivatives of a stem *randā-*, pre-Germ. **rondho-*, which appears in Lith. *rāndas* 'stripe, weal, scar,' Skt. *rāndhra-* 'opening, crevice, hole, defect, weakness.' From the same word in the last sense come also Skt. *radhrā-* 'poor, unhappy, wretched,' *rādhyati* 'yield, serve; torment, torture,' *rāndhāyati* 'torment, torture, subject.' This last word is similar in formation to Germ. **randjan* 'rend.'

These are probably also connected with OHG. *rant* 'rand,' OE. *ronð* 'edge,' *rind* 'bark, rind, crust,' OHG. *rinta* 'rinde,' Hess. *runde* 'rinde einer wunde.' The development in meaning is here 'wound, scratch, scar, scab, crust, rind,' etc. The meaning 'edge' comes from 'mark.'

14. OE. *woffian* 'talk wildly or foolishly, blaspheme,' *wæfian* 'talk foolishly' are evidently connected with Lith. *vapū*, *vapēti*, *vāpālioju*, *-lioti* 'chatter, babble.' Compare further ON. *-vafr* 'nonsense,' OE. *wæfer-hūs* 'theatre,' *wæfer-nes* 'pomp, pageant,' *wæfþ*, *wæfer-sien*, OHG. *wabar-siuni* 'show, spectacle.'

The root *wēp-*, from which the above words come, must have meant 'throw about, move rapidly.' This would give 'act or talk wildly; gesticulate, make performance,' etc. Compare the similar development in meaning in Lat. *pālor* 'wander about, struggle,' OHG. *fasōn* 'hin und her suchen:' NHG. *faseln* (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *faseln*; Brugmann, *Grd.* 12, 765); and for the second meaning Lat. *actio*, *actus*, *gesticulatio*, etc.

This primary signification is seen in OE. *wāfian* 'waver, hesitate, be amazed, wonder at, gaze in wonder at,' *wāfung* 'amazement, pageantry.' These show plainly the development in OE. *wæfer-nes* 'pomp, pageant,' etc., and prove connection with OE. *wāfian* 'wave, brandish,' ON. *vāfa* 'vibrate,' *vafra*, MHG. *wabern* 'waver,' OE. *wāfre* 'wandering, flickering.' Compare also Skt. *vāpati* 'scatter, strew, throw,' *vāpus* 'wondrous, beautiful; wonder, beautiful appearance,' where the same change in meaning has taken place. Here also probably belong Lith. *vėpelis* 'maulaffe,' *vėplinu* 'go about with open mouth, gape,' that

is, 'gaze in wonder at,' like OE. *wāfian*.

The root *uē-p-* in the above I take to be an outgrowth of *uē-* 'turn, twist, roll.'

15. A similar development is seen in OE. *windan* 'wind, twist, turn, move, delay, hesitate,' *ge-wand* 'being ashamed, hesitation, scruple,' *wandian* 'hesitate, care for, regard, stand in awe of,' *wundor* 'wonder, wonderful thing,' that is, 'something to stand in awe of, something amazing.' The last word has been compared with Gk. *ἀσπείω* 'look earnestly, gaze at.' This is almost the same as OE. *wandian* 'regard, stand in awe of.'

The entire group may be referred to the root *uendh-* 'turn, twist.' Here perhaps Gk. *ἀσπείω* 'play, sport' < **uendhurjō* 'turn about, run to and fro.' The root *uendh-* is perhaps nasalized from *uēdh-* 'lead, guide,' that is, 'turn, direct.' The root *uēdh-* also signifies 'turn, twist, struggle, win' in Gk. *ἀεθλον* 'prize;' and 'turn, twist, bind' in Goth. *wadi* 'pledge.' (Cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *winden, wenden, wandern, Wunder*; and Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *wadi*.)

16. For Germ. *wambō-* 'belly, stomach, womb:' Goth., OHG. *wamba*, OE. *wamb*, ON. *vamb*, no satisfactory explanation has been given. Compare Skt. *vapā* < **uumpā-* 'caul, omentum.' The Skt. word corresponds in formation and gender with the Germ., and in ablaut with OHG. *wumba*. Primarily **uompā-*, **uumpā-* must have meant 'wrapper, veil, covering,' and was then applied to the membrane enveloping the bowels or the fetus, and finally to what was so covered.

For this development in meaning compare: Goth. *nati*, OE. *net* 'net:' *nette* 'caul,' Gk. *νηδύς* 'belly, bowels, stomach, womb' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *nati*); E. *caul* 'covering of network for the head, net: omentum, amnion;' OE. *hama* 'dress, covering: womb.'

It is quite possible that IE. **uompā-* 'wrapper, covering: caul, stomach, womb' is from a root *ue(m)p-* 'throw, swing, sway,' which is the same as *uēp-* in Skt. *vāpati* 'scatter, throw,' OE. *wafian* 'wave,' etc. (v. supra). The original meaning of IE. **uompā-* would then be 'a swinging, swaying, flapping; flap, veil, covering.' Compare Goth. *ga-wigan* 'shake, move,' Lat. *vehō*: *vēlum* (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 769); OE. *scēolan* 'shoot, throw, move quickly:' *scēat* 'piece of cloth, cloak, lap, bosom.'

We may therefore compare Lith. *vamplys* 'Jemand, der mit offenem Munde oder mit dicker herabhängender Lippe dasteht oder umhergeht,' *vaiṣpliuu, -linti* 'go around with hanging jaw,' which are closely related to Lith. *vėplys, vėpelis* 'Maulaffe,' *vėplinu* 'go about with open mouth.'

17. E. *rowlock* is explained by Kluge and Lutz, *Eng. Et.*, as 'hole for rowing,' the last part being compared with NHG. *loch* 'hole.' It is true that *-lock* in *rowlock* is related to NHG. *loch*, but the signification is not the same. OE. *ār-loc*, of which *rowlock* seems to be a corruption, is a compound of *ār* 'oar' and *loc* 'lock, fastening.' Whether this fastening consisted of pegs, or tholes, or of a notch in the gunwale of the boat, it was thought of as a 'fastening' not as a 'hole.' Hence E. *oarlock*, *rowlock* is exactly what its composition would indicate, a 'lock or fastening for the oar.'

Aside from the fact that OE. *loc* never means 'hole,' other OE. words for 'rowlock' make it improbable that OE. *ār-loc* meant 'oar-hole.' Compare OE. *ār-wippe* 'oar-withe, rowlock;' *hamole* 'oar-thong, rowlock' (compare ON. *hemill* 'thong for hobbling horse,' *hemja* 'hemmen,' etc.); *mīdl, mīpl* 'horse's bit: oar-thong' (compare OE. *mīdlian* 'restrain, bridle, muzzle,' Goth. *ga-maiþs* 'crippled,' etc.); *þol* 'thole, rowlock' (compare Lith. *tūlis* 'ein Stecksel in der Seite des Ruderkahns zum Festanlegen des grossen Ruders,' Gk. *τύλος* 'knot, knob, wooden bolt').

From the above we are justified in assuming that OE. *ār-loc* meant 'oar-fastening, oar-holder,' and could be applied either to a thole or a thong. There is nothing in the derivation of the word to exclude the latter. For the Germ. word *lock*, OE. *lūcan*, etc., meant primarily 'pull, bend, twist,' and then 'tie, bind, fasten.' Compare OHG. *liohhan* 'pull, wrestle,' Gk. *λυγίζω* 'bend, twist, wrestle,' *λυγώω* 'bend, fasten,' OE. *lūcan* 'pull up, join together, interlace, close, confine,' *hand-locen* 'linked or woven by hand.' (Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *galūkan*; author, *Jour. Germ. Phil.* ii, 224.)

18. Of NHG. *guter Dinge* Kluge, *Et. Wb.*, says nothing. Paul in his *DWb.* mentions the phrase under *Ding*. So also Heyne. From this we are to conclude that *guter Dinge* is in

the gen. plur. neut. I think it more probable, however, that we have here a gen. sing. fem., and that *Dinge* in this expression is from OHG. *dingi*, fem., 'hope, confidence,' MHG. *dinge*, same. Compare OHG. *thingan*, *dingan*, MHG. *dingen* 'hope, believe, be confident.'

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Cornell College.

[As to *rowlock*, the interpretation of *-lock* as a "fastening," with the primary meaning of "something bent, twisted, joined together," can be supported by archaeological evidence. Oar-holes, or at least holes which unmistakably served as such, are not found in the remains of any Germanic boat ante-dating the viking period. They were obviously out of the question in the shallow dugouts mentioned by Vellejus, and equally so in the larger ones used, according to the elder Pliny, for open-sea navigation. Notches in the gunwales are met with in one large boat of this kind. But the earliest form of rowlock seems to have consisted in a loop of bast rope, withes, or leather, attached to the gunwale; later, the loop passed through a hole in a piece of wood fastened upon the gunwale, and so shaped as to keep the oar from slipping in the recover; in the next stage of the evolution the wooden part and the loop attached to it exchanged functions: the former, now curving upward and backward, served as a fulcrum in the stroke, while the loop, through which the oar was stuck, came into play in the recover and in backing. The two forms of rowlock last mentioned are found in the Anglian (or Danish?) boats of Nydam (third century). The more advanced of these forms, which is characteristic of the twenty-eight-oar boat of Nydam, has remained in uninterrupted use, for sea-going row- and sailboats of moderate dimensions, through the viking age (when the larger vessels, with their higher free-board, had to resort to oar-holes), down to the present day; the fishing-boats of northern Norway having even now for rowlocks the *keipar* of the sagas, crooks or curved pieces of wood on the gunwale, with loops of leather or of twisted or braided withes. That the Anglo-Saxon rowlock was of the same material and general style is shown by the designations *hamole* and *är-wippe*.

H. K. S.]

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Heine's Prose, with Introduction and Notes by ALBERT B. FAUST, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899. li, 341 pp.

THIS new edition of copious selections from Heine's prose works immediately challenges comparison with the well-known edition by Professor Buchheim in the Clarendon Press Series. The plan of both is essentially the same, and could hardly be other than it is for the purpose in view; no one of Heine's longer prose works is given complete, but extracts from all the important ones are included. How variously representative these extracts are of the complete works will appear from the fact that in the Faust edition the ratio of the selection to the whole runs from about one-third of the *Harzreise* and one-fourth of the *Memoiren* to one-fifty-fifth of *Lutezia*. Usually there are grave objections to the abridgment of masterpieces for school use. There is no more justification for the editorial mutilation of an essay or a work of fiction than for placing before students mere fragments of dramas or of lyric poems; the artistic unity of the whole is presumably as important in one case as in another. Heine's prose work is a rare exception to this rule, however, in that it is essentially fragmentary at best, and that its structural value is insignificant as compared with the value of its style and subject-matter, so that there is relatively little lost in studying his prose in excerpts.

Prof. Faust's edition is superior to Prof. Buchheim's as a representative collection of Heine's prose, not so much because it contains about one-seventh more matter, as because it includes parts of important works that were neglected in the older edition, notably considerable extracts from the *Memoiren* and the *Geständnisse*, and brief samples of *Die Bäder von Lucca*, *Aus den Memoiren des Herren von Schnabelewopski*, *Florentinische Nächte*, and *Lutezia*: the inclusion of the insipid "Humoreske" *Der Thee* is of more questionable advantage. The selection of portions to be included in a school edition is so largely a matter of individual taste that probably no two editors would come to the same result, and any criticism would have only the value of a personal opinion; it may suffice to say that there is not much to choose between the two editions

in that regard. Perhaps it is not a matter of personal caprice, however, to regret the omission of *König ist der Hirtenknabe* and *Ich bin die Prinzessin Ilse* from the *Harzreise*, while the one lyric that Heine himself left out after the first edition is retained.

The arrangement of the material in the new edition—chronological throughout—is to be preferred to that of the old. The map of the Harz region is a welcome help, though it is not quite accurate, as the line representing Heine's trip does not touch the Brocken.

The notes, though falling short of the notorious copiousness of all the Buchheim editions, are quite full, and, on the whole, accurate. They are marked, however, by a certain inconsistency and disproportion, as if the editor had widely different grades of pupils in mind in making them. But Heine's style is no milk for babes, and the editor might have taken pretty thorough preparation for granted in his readers. Examples of unnecessary aid are the translations in the notes of such simple words and expressions as *ohne Umstände*, *Meerrettig*, *Halskragen*, *Felsenplatte*, *Kot am Meer*, *auf allen Vieren*, *gleich wichtig*, *verlarvt*, *Gängelband*, *Düne*, *welthistorisch*, *Chignons* (incorrectly translated "braids"), *Firnis*, *Kehricht*, *Söller*. The same criticism applies to the frequent biographical notes on celebrities of universal fame, such as Raphael, Calderon, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Sterne, Richardson, Goldsmith, Fielding, and others. On the other hand, even advanced students of German might need some help on *illuminirt*, p. 66, l. 27, on *Bête allemande*, p. 67, l. 26 (nine out of ten will call it "German beast"), on the phrase *singen und sagen*, p. 201, l. 33, and on a number of characteristically odd expressions on which the notes give no aid. As literary and historical references are carefully noted throughout, the biblical quotations on p. 204, l. 14 and p. 219, l. 8 should be referred to Jeremiah xxxi, 29 and Ecclesiastes i, 9. In the note on *Enthusiasmusfässchen*, p. 84, l. 22, there should be a reference to the last chapter of Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*. *Papagoyim*, p. 89, l. 7, should be noted, not merely as "an unusual plural," but as a humorous imitation of the Hebrew plural. The connotation of *Vor- und Nachdenker*, p. 94, l. 20, should be more sharply defined, with possibly a reference to Prometheus and Epimetheus. The mere translation

of *larmoyant*, p. 136, l. 26, gives the student no hint of the allusion to the "comédie larmoyante."

A few suggestions as to what is infelicitous or misleading in the annotation may be of some value for a future revision. On p. 235, next to last line, "refractoriness" would express the idea better than "brittleness;" p. 20, l. 22, *trocken* is rather "dry-as-dust" than "stilted;" middle of p. 273, "parody" should be "satire." Most students will have no idea that *I. Mose*, note to p. 33, l. 25, means "Genesis." The reference of Heine's romantic egotism to the influence of the Fichtean philosophy, note to p. 37, l. 11, is a strange confusion of ideas—as if Fichte were responsible for a European movement that was in full sweep when he was an infant! "The holy Genevieve," p. 38, l. 2, should read "Saint Genevieve."—The statement that "the monologues of Faust" are written in *Knittelversen*, note to p. 74, l. 8, is quite misleading.—P. 103, l. 22f., "the twaddle of tonsured mountebanks" is nearer the color of *die Salbadereien geschorener Gaukler* than "idle assurances of shaven jugglers," which obscures the clerical allusion; in the note to p. 110, l. 5, "erected" should be "laid out;" p. 283, first line, "triumphal song" would be better; p. 118, l. 32, "*black and dirty*" confuses rather than explains the obvious play on the word *schwarz*.—It may be questioned whether Bismarck would have met Heine's expectation of "the third liberator," p. 121, ll. 6-13.—The note to p. 130, l. 5, is misleading in form: Chateaubriand and Mérimée are hardly well-chosen representatives of the *revolutionary* phase of French Romanticism, as Hugo certainly is.—P. 131, ll. 19ff., *Lanzelot* is no more an "adaptation from French originals" than *Iwein*, or any other of the MHG. romances; the reference to "the manner of Hartmann and Wolfram" is absolutely meaningless to almost any student who will use this book; and of Wagner's "musical dramas" only *Parzival* really deals with the Grail subject.—P. 138, l. 31, Werner is not, properly speaking, the "originator" of the Tragedy of Fate; p. 139, l. 22, *Volksbücher* would be better rendered "chap-books" than "folks' books;" p. 156, l. 16, "received asylum" is unidiomatic for "found refuge;" p. 168, l. 12, *Hintersassen* here means "vassals," or better "minions,"—"small farmers of his fame" is meaningless.—

In the note to p. 170, l. 6, it is manifestly wrong to speak of Hölderlin as belonging to a "school" of which Uhland was the "founder;" Hölderlin's work was ended when Uhland was rhyming his first crude ballads.—George Sand certainly did not call her son "Moritz" (p. 185, l. 5): if Heine does, that is no reason why an American editor should follow his example.—P. 192, l. 7, *leidige Familienrücksichten* means "unfortunate," not "odious," family considerations; p. 211, l. 3, "renegade romanticist" gives the force of Elster's *entlaufen*, as "run-away" does not.—When Heine speaks, p. 149, l. 11, of three odes on Schlegel, all beginning *O du, der du—*, he is evidently cracking one of his jokes; of course these odes never existed, but are a pleasant fiction that serves as a humorous recantation of the really laudatory sonnets on Schlegel.

Heine's derisive and unintelligent criticism of French poetry and versification, pp. 194, 216, is explained by the notorious fact that he never mastered even the rudiments of the subject, and never developed the slightest feeling for French rhythm; this is evident, for example, from the barbarous error he makes in quoting a French Alexandrine verse in his *Memoiren* (Elster vii, 476):

Où l'innocence périt, c'est un crime de vivre.

Prof. Faust follows Prof. Buchheim in his explanation of *das Ross Bayards*, p. 170, l. 4. Both of them overlook the direct source from which Heine undoubtedly took the incident in question, a source to which, in fact, no one has yet called attention. In Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*, to which Heine's *Über Deutschland* is a sort of rejoinder, the ninth chapter of the first part closes with these words:

"on pourrait appliquer, en général, à tous ces esprits, à tous ces ouvrages imités du français, l'éloge que Roland, dans l'Arioste, fait de son jument qu'il traîne après lui: *Elle réunit, dit-il, toutes les qualités imaginables; mais elle a pourtant un défaut, c'est qu'elle est morte.*"

The "point" is worked out here exactly as it is by Heine, and as it is not in Ariosto. The substitution of *Bayard* for *Roland*, both names of famous French heroes, is just such a freak of Heine's memory as the substitution of *Käthchen* for Goethe's *Gretchen*, and of the name of the city of *Lampsakus* for that of the philosopher *Pittakus*.

In the Introduction, the effect of translating *Kahldorf*, the pseudonym of Robert Wesselhöft, as "Barren-Village" (p. xxx), is odd and confusing. On p. l. the reference to titles and prose lines containing grammatical errors as "verses" is evidently a slip. "Knight" would be better than "champion" to render *Ritter vom heiligen Geist*, p. xxvi. It is not clear what the editor means by a "qualitative" appreciation of Greek and Latin, p. xi, unless it be a superficial knowledge of these languages.

Misprints are more numerous than they need be in a work of this sort. The following were noted in a cursory examination: In the Introduction: P. xii, l. 10, comma after *sister*; p. xvii, l. 1, comma after *discussions*; p. xviii, l. 15, *Ratcliff*; p. xxvi, l. 3 from below, *Allgemeine*; p. xxxii, l. 23, omit hyphen in *Allgemeine-Zeitung*; p. xxxiii, l. 8 from below, comma after *Hamburg*; p. xxxiv, l. 2, *Shakespeares* (this is a normalized text, and the usual form of the name should be followed consistently; cf. the notes to p. 138, l. 13; p. 161, l. 28; p. 180, l. 2); p. xliii, l. 22, *révolutionnaire*; p. xlv, l. 3 from below, *Kunz von der Rosen* should not be in italics; p. xlv, l. 1f., omit comma after *man*, and insert *who* before *should*; p. xlviii, l. 12, *was*, and comma before it; and l. 15, omit comma after *Singen*. In the Text: P. 45, l. 33, *smolliert*; p. 68, l. 22, *aristocrates* (and so in the note); p. 138, l. 13, *Shakespeare* (ending, and same error in the note); p. 149, l. 15, *glänzten*; p. 197, l. 6, *millionnaire*; p. 206, l. 29, *die* for *der*; p. 209, l. 5, *besten*. In the Notes: To p. 20, l. 31, comma after *terminations*; p. 31, l. 2f., *Tieck* and *Goethe* for *Tieck by Goethe*; p. 39, l. 8, comma after *Mephistopheles*; p. 70, l. 28, *assumed* for *assured*; p. 88, l. 2, *schwitzte*; p. 117, l. 18, *the British monk Winfred* should not be in italics; p. 118, l. 12, comma after *Egypt*; p. 131, l. 19, one *l*; p. 136, l. 23, *K. W. Ramler*; p. 151, l. 6, *objectionable*; p. 151, l. 27, comma after *Volksbuch*; p. 156, l. 5, *eine*; p. 162, l. 2, *Der Freimütige* for *the Freimütigen*; *Page 163* for *Page 162*; p. 216, l. 32, *misquoted* for *quoted*, and comma after *Malet*; p. 228, l. 22, *Ganasche*; p. 228, l. 27 (on p. 327), omit comma after *bilden*.

The notes are unfortunately quite inconsistent in giving references to the complete edition of Heine's works for the passages

selected, and in supplying summaries of the matter omitted. Especially where the editor substitutes a new chapter-division for that of the original edition should this fact be noted. As this obviously important information is carefully supplied for the extracts from *Über Deutschland*, and in part for *Der Rabbi von Bacharach*, it is all the more surprising to find it absolutely omitted from the notes on *Ideen, Italien*, and *Die Harzreise*.

The new edition is a great improvement over the old as a sample of book-making, and indeed the whole new Macmillan series deserves the highest praise in that regard. It seems unfortunate, however, that the larger type of most of the other texts in this series was not used here; this might have been done without adding unduly to the bulk of the book or to its cost. But the last word must be one of satisfaction that so thoroughly excellent an edition of Heine's prose is now available in this attractive form and at a remarkably low price.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Drame ancien et Drame moderne, par ÉMILE FAGUET. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie, 1898. 274 pp.

UP to the present time we have had no literary work by the followers of M. Brunetière in which the theory of evolution had been applied. It had been generally adopted by the school of dogmatic or objective criticism, carefully studied and criticised by them. M. René Doumic has given to the public a number of volumes of literary essays and two works on the drama, but these are all philosophical analyses and discussions of authors and works of various literary tendencies and periods. This can be said of all the works of the younger generation of critics. M. Brunetière's theory has been very strongly attacked, and these attacks have brought to light a number of weak and defective points, which were found in those of his works in which he applied his principles; such as *La Poésie Lyrique*, *Les Époques du théâtre* and *L'Évolution de la critique*. Every new theory in literature and

art, as well as in science, has a period of development in which many errors and defects are found, but these are gradually eliminated, thus bringing the principles of the theory to a state of perfection, in which it is generally adopted. M. Brunetière's theory, first applied and exposed in 1890, has passed through this same development and not until the appearance of his *Manuel* has this theory been applied in all its breadth and extent. The defects have disappeared, the weaknesses have been covered, and now we have the theory in its fullest development. One of the most forceful and just objections to the theory, and one which opened vulnerable points in the works of M. Brunetière, was that in the application of the theory of evolution he had left unnoticed the theory of the generation of one talent by the other, and of the filiation and evolution of methods through species. In the *Manuel* this objection is no longer valid, for in every epoch and every school we read how minor writers either perpetuate the methods of their predecessors and thus form schools and found traditions; or they break away from them and oppose their methods and tradition, thus changing schools or species and transforming methods. These comparatively unknown writers in the application of the theory of evolution become important. In the *Manuel* the theory is applied in its broadest sense; in this the reader no longer has the principles pointed out to him as in the former works; the author has gone a step farther and applied them in their broadest philosophical sense. M. Émile Faguet is the first of the followers who has attempted a practical application of this theory. Heretofore his works have been marked by an acute and keen sense of analysis, by a wonderful power of characterization of an epoch, school or individual, by an exceptionally clear and logical presentation of his subjects, which have been in the form of essays. In his study of the ancient and modern drama he branches out. He has faithfully studied and carefully considered every principle of the theory of evolution, its possibilities, effects and applicability to literature. The results he now applies to the history and nature of tragedy. He touches upon all points of the theory—the people, religion, nature, traits, environment,

age, etc.—; by means of this he is able to analyze and explain the three kinds of tragedy—Greek, English, French. This work is not only of interest to the student, but to every cultured reader. Every literary work that applies this theory is by its very nature of great interest and value; in it we can see principles applied and conclusions drawn, which throw light on all other studies, and which can be in turn applied by ourselves to our own particular field of observation; for in it the history of particular literatures is subordinated to that of the general history of literature. The following synopsis can hardly do justice to the great value of M. Faguet's work. This book is like the *Manuel*, it must be read and carefully studied.

What is dramatic emotion? The theatre is nothing more than a playground where men assemble to see their fellow men suffer. Tragedy and comedy are both founded on this principle of suffering; the difference lies simply in the degree of intensity or importance of the results of passion. It is a constant painting of the misfortunes of humanity and these take different forms with different schools and epochs. Man, however, cannot endure too much suffering; when the stage presents too much he begins to suffer himself. Now the drama must know how great a dose of suffering it can present without affecting man. The second point in the drama is that it makes man reflect upon human suffering, and this reflection brings out suffering in its full truth; it also explains why man dislikes the drama that paints humanity as happy. Man enjoys seeing suffering and unhappiness presented because he himself takes an inexpressible pleasure in overcoming them, which is a remnant of his old self, at a time when he himself had to win his place by hard struggles. He cares not to have the state of happiness described, but the means, the struggles, and hardships that had to be overcome to reach this happiness.

What did French tragedy borrow from the Greek? How does it differ from it and from that of other nations? What are its characteristics? The wonderfully fruitful development of French drama is due to the nature of the people, which is highly delicate, sensitive and curious; it loves pleasure in all forms, whence

its love for the theatre and public assemblages, which is stronger than that of any other nation, except the Greek.

Art is always the reflection of the social state and this grows gradually, has its periods of formation, maturity and decay; art reflects these. The individual has but one maturity, a people can have many. A people is only transformed, it never dies, hence has various periods of childhood and maturity. The French people have passed through the feudal, monarchical, and are now in a new state. Each one of these has had its periods of childhood, maturity and decay, in politics, religion and art. The seventeenth century is a development of the traditions of the sixteenth, and of the new impulse from without, of the Renaissance. In order to trace the influence of Greece we must trace the foundation and spirit of the Middle Ages, and then observe what the Greek and Latin spirit of the Renaissance has added. Noticeable in the spirit of the Middle Ages is the absence of enthusiasm and imagination; it was practical and dogmatic, clear and concise, which carries along with it order and logic. This spirit of logic and clearness carries with it, in French, one of movement. The French reason not for the sake of reasoning, but to arrive at a truth or an application of truth; they love *le dénouement*, and direct all their efforts to it, whence this vivacity and *allure* in French literature. This is more literary than artistic, and more didactic than literary, showing little creative genius. To this the Middle Ages have added a spirit of enthusiasm and mysticism. From this results the tormented art of the Middle Ages. Antiquity introduced its particular kind of sensibility and imagination. Its imagination is more sober and stronger, being subordinated to the idea of beauty and holding it in a precise and luminous line. The elements of order, logic and clearness are found again and recognized by the French in the ancients, which were somewhat obscured by the Middle Ages. Thus was the French spirit formed, of which tragedy is the most striking representation; it was born at the same time with the classical spirit, it reached its culmination with it, and as it began its downward course, tragedy followed in its path.

Art in its broadest sense has three principal

branches: forms, words, rhythms. Each one has its particular aim, but all have the common goal of beauty. There is no absolute separation, only distinction, for each one penetrates the domain of the other to a larger or smaller degree. One supplies what the other lacks. The artist must not endeavor to make one branch supply what is in the realm of another, as is done in naturalistic literature when it busies itself with minute and monotonous details to rival a painting. There are divisions and limitations of species, according to their means of execution; these species of art are limited to certain universal conditions, as space and time. The plastic arts immobilize forms and suspend action. Literature's productions present living and changing pictures, but the traits are brought out one by one, and memory must reconstitute the image of the *ensemble*. Music produces movement or the sensation of the ideal movement, thus paints sentiments which are in turn movements of the soul, and these are nearest being outside of time and space. Music resorts to speech and dance, which are its narration and painting. These three arts have three functions—those of seeing, thinking and feeling. These often unite; when we have a union of the arts of design, word and melody, we have the largest and broadest expression of human art, being the most complete painting of life; this is dramatic art. It is an art that proposes to paint human life; for its means it has living men taken from life, before other men assembled to see them. Thus it does not exclude any art, because life includes all. Dramatic art thus has the advantage of being able to resort to any of the arts; whereas, these taken separately, do not have this liberty. A great difficulty arises now. How subordinate this complex system of arts to a principle in order to form a unity? Which one of the arts must be the head? The one which in itself comes nearest to fulfilling the mission of dramatic art, which is a painting of human life. Dramatic art, since it demands expression and speech above all, is a literary art, but can call upon all other arts as auxiliaries to complete its painting of life. In Greece it has shown a harmonious union of all arts, such as is seen nowhere else. Dramatic art there is a union of the plastic, epic, rhythmic,

musical and dramatic. Greek tragedy lacks action; there is no intrigue well concocted and skilfully unraveled; no rapid succession of scenes closely connected. It is a beautiful poem or epic episode, with a majestic and quiet *allure*, with only the form of a drama. It cannot be judged by the same rules as the French; it forms a beauty of its own. It contains immense narrations filled with incomparable picturesqueness of details. More importance is given to the complete painting of character than to continuity of action. It loves the beautiful for the beautiful, and this makes the drama often more of a grand scene or tragic picture than a real drama; it remains a grand piece of sculpture work. The Greeks had no curiosity, hence their drama is so different from ours. The people knew what the end of the drama would be beforehand, and did not come to the theatre for the pleasure of curiosity; this naturally led to the disregard of the unity of action, which is the very principle of the interest of curiosity. Greek drama is an epic episode put on the stage, made up of useless tales, digressions, a weak intrigue or none at all, a multiple action or none at all, the interest of curiosity nearly absent, with a considerable lyric portion, in songs partly describing human grief, passion, triumph, etc. There is an abundance of majestic comparisons, in a lyric or elegiac strain, always dreamy and contemplative. It is a continuous mixing of lyric and dramatic poetry, in which action is only a means of binding together the threads of the ode, elegy, etc. The aim is the musical expression of the sentiments; the interest is not centered in the issue of the struggle, but on the struggle itself. In the spoken part there is an intimate union and harmonious combination of the epic, lyric and dramatic arts; in the not-spoken part the rhythmic and plastic arts aid speech by sustaining it by all the power of music, and encasing it in all the prestige of sculptural and architectural decoration. Thus Greek drama is a complete perfect type.

In the development of the modern drama there was a period of uncertainty during which dramatic art was hesitating between the exact imitation of ancient models, and an irregular and free inspiration proper to itself. The Italians adopted the antique form; the Spanish

and English abandoning the musical, plastic and lyric branches, developed the dramatic and epic almost exclusively. Compared to the drama of episode of the Greeks, theirs is a poem with fewer forms, but with an extraordinary wealth of material and matter, showing a profound knowledge of the historical causes and effects of characters, manners, etc. In regard to characters the Greek drama takes a simple, clear character, and describes and paints it in a thousand ways with the resources of its manifold art. The English drama enlarges the material matter and amplifies the moral in painting a character, embracing it in all its breadth and complexity; it paints a soul in all its diversity and all its depth. The Greek only deals with one sentiment or one movement, as an obstinate warrior in a state of resentment refusing to return to camp. The assassin comes, sees, and kills; we see nothing of his inner torments, etc. In the English we learn the temperament, habits, manner of thinking, etc. We learn how the assassin acts; his whole complex nature develops and unfolds itself before us. Long periods of history are put on the scene, and humanity itself is taken as a character. The people, represented by the chorus in the Greek drama, not a real actor nor an accessory, but a kind of half-active being, not affecting the action, takes an important part in the modern drama; it represents the spirit of a whole epoch. Thus the modern drama must reach a limit; it extends its branches as far as nature allows, until it has reached a point where it places on the scene humanity in its entirety as a character. It admits both the comic and the tragic. However, the unity of impression does not allow a drama to be half comic and half tragic; the impression it leaves must be either one or the other. They do not exclude each other, as in nature both elements are found. The English drama uses both almost constantly, while the Greek, only admitting one side of life, one moment of time, one simple action, one simple character, one simple impression, rarely uses both. The English drama in its effort to paint man, humanity, history, whole epochs of civilization, goes out in great conquests; it goes even farther than is plausible, thus weakening the interest, dispersing it and even changing the unity of

impression. It discovers new regions and adds them to its domain, thus broadening and enlarging its empire. Thus, then, the English drama is no longer the harmonious synthesis of all forms of art, but the strong and profound expression of life. The drama gave a full sensation of an harmonious *ensemble*, a contemplative joy, which is the pleasure of an artistic people; now it gives an intense sensation of varied life, an impassioned joy, which is the pleasure of an observing and curious people. It has changed from the artistic to the philosophical.

The French drama has gone one step further in almost altogether excluding the epic, plastic, lyric, and rhythmic, preserving the dramatic alone. The lyric was dropped gradually, being absorbed in the monologue. The epic, which is an important accessory in the Greek and the very foundation of the English drama, is entirely absent. It imposes the three unities as absolute laws. Two traits in the French race account for the suppression of the epic and lyric; it is by nature neither poetic nor lyric, whence its love for *pièces de théâtre* which come near being simple conversation; second, its love for clearness. It desires to see clearly and quickly what is going on; whence, its love for clear-cut species, subdivisions of *genres* so well marked in French literature, whose spirit is to seize the essence of things and to give it a succinct form. Therefore French tragedy has dropped the other branches and preserved the pure dramatic in its most simple, precise expression, and easiest to seize well. This dramatic branch it has developed into action or intrigue which is the logic of the drama—and logic is a quality of the French race. This intrigue means to have a certain number of forces act and react upon one another, to combine the *coups* and *contre-coups*, and to lead from causes to effects, always proportioned to their causes, the series always well-connected of premises and consequences, to a final consequence contained in the first facts, which is called the *dénouement*. This requires precision, distinctness and vigor or *esprit*, and in this the French have become masters. No developments that delay action, whose merit lies in beauty alone; no painting of characters not necessary, whose merit lies in being profound.

Only that is brought out that leads to action. This is the narrowest dramatic conception in the world. The next point is *le problème* which leads to pure logic; it is a sort of syllogism. Where the Greek finds occasion for artistic developments of all kinds, the English for moral and historical observation, the French only sees energy, force, action, machinery and wheelwork, whose lead he likes to follow. This intrigue serves to arouse an interest of curiosity which is a characteristic mark of the French nature and one the Greek hardly possessed. If the intrigue is the main part of the drama and curiosity supports it, then the *dénouement* must remain unknown to the audience; this is one of the most important requisites of French drama. Thus, then, the interest of curiosity replaces all other dramatic means, and this naturally demands that the interest be not dispersed, hence unities are necessary. The interest of action is nothing more than the unity of curiosity. From this result two characteristics in French tragedy—rapidity and progression. Every scene must serve to tie or untie the plot, each discourse must be a preparation or an obstacle. There must be continual new, strong elements to keep up the interest. But this intrigue is not enough for the drama; after having abandoned all parts except the dramatic and reduced that to mere intrigue, how could the French poet compensate for all this loss? The greater part of French tragedies are too long in spite of their brevity, because they are built up on dramas that were rich only in accessories, and because they abandoned these accessories without substituting anything in their place except a more detailed intrigue. French nature, however, supplied the want. The trait already mentioned of practical philosophers and didactic moralists comes to the rescue. They made of the drama a moral lesson, a sustaining of a thesis. Thus the two principal characteristics of French nature, curiosity and moral predication, are found in the drama in the scenic movement and moral predication, in rapid intrigue and philosophical dissertation, whence come the characters of *raisonneur* and *confidant* who take the rôle of moralists. Two characteristics result from this—a tendency to moralize and a sententious and oratorical character. Maxims and dis-

courses abound and these increase all the more as the rapidity of action increases. The practical reasoning produces the didactic spirit and this in turn creates orators. Thus, then, French tragedy is built up on well-conducted intrigues, lofty moral lessons and well-made and eloquent discourses. The nature of the drama forbids any detailed psychological painting and development of characters. The characters must be described quickly and accurately, and to do this one single force or trait is taken up and carried out to the end. Such characters produced by a purely logical and didactic moralist are abstract creations, not living and real; they are creations of reason, ideal, abstract, so different from those of the English drama, which produces a rich and powerful *ensemble* of life, and not a suite of ideas that create and sustain each other. The characters of French drama are rather types than personages, truths and not realities; ideas, not beings; to create them it takes no effort of the imagination, but logic. In history, too, it seeks situations only; single events and not entire epochs; a striking and illustrious deed for the final act, so to speak. But not all French tragedy has confined itself to this system. In some we find characters that live, with a rich and powerful life, changing before the audience; epochs, peoples, a true historical state; for example, *Polyeucte*, *Cinna*, *Britannicus*, *Horace*, *Athalie*. In these even the action does not allow the poet much room for painting the characters in their manifold nature or the historical part; people do not appear because the simplicity of the dramatic construction does not allow many characters, and only when the spirit of an epoch is manifested in the enclosure of a palace can it be painted. These difficulties then nearly always prevent French tragedy from being the work of a true moralist and historian; but when once it does succeed it is really great.

A practical illustration of these three systems is given by a comparison of the three dramas *Antigone*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Le Cid*. In this the three types of characters or lovers are compared, analyzed and results drawn—*Antigone* and *Hémon*, *Juliet* and *Romeo*, *Chimène* and *Rodrigue*.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

PROVENÇAL POETRY.

Frederi Mistral, der Dichter der Provence.

VON NICOLAUS WELTER. Mit Mistral's Bildnis. Marburg: N. G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1899. 8vo, 356 pp.

UNDOUBTEDLY Mr. Nicolaus Welter has chosen a sublime topic, the treatment of which requires above all a keen sense of the beautiful. We would certainly be wrong in denying him this precious faculty, the lack of which is frequently the reason that simple-minded enthusiastic readers are better judges of the merits of a great living poet than critics famous for their learning and acuteness. Mr. Welter loves his poet, a most natural feeling in regard to the great "empereur du midi," "le roi du soleil," with whom since the publication of *Mireio* all countries and nations sympathize. But Mr. Welter's admiration is not blind, as we shall soon see.

His interesting book, which is full of pleasant detail, is dedicated to August Bertuch, the peerless German translator of *Mireio* and *Nerto*. It is divided into the following twelve chapters: i. Childhood and College Years; ii. The Félibrige; iii. *Mireio*; iv. The Latin Confederation; v. *Calendau*; vi. *Lis isclo d'or*; vii. The *Capoulié*; viii. *Nerto*; ix. *Maiano*; x. *La Réino Tano*; xi. The *Song of the Rhone*; xii. *Epilogue*. The reader is consequently prepared for a most eloquently written biography interspersed with the principal dates which mark the gradually spreading influence of the Félibrige, and in addition skilfully analyzed poems the chronological order of which has been strictly observed. If Mr. Welter expects his public to pick out but one or two chapters at a time in order to spend a pleasant hour over their amusing contents, his arrangement will certainly meet with general approval. But those who will read his book through from beginning to end will be puzzled now and then in case they are not sufficiently versed in the history of the modern Renaissance of Provence, or will make the unpleasant discovery that very fine and touching effects created by the clever writer are checked or even counteracted by his frequently grouping together rather incongruous elements. The chapter on *Maiano*, for instance, is full of all sorts of information on Mistral's later years, his house, the death of

his mother, of dear friends, his trip to Italy, etc. This chapter is placed directly after *Nerto*; and *Queen Tane* and the *Song of the Rhone* when their turn comes, are rather severely criticised. We all know that Mistral was not born to be a dramatist, a statement which needed no further discussion. But his last epic poem deserves a fair judgment. Mr. Welter has forgotten to consider that as a rule the last pages of a book count double. Or does he believe that the charming *Epilogue*, the product of his own fancy, will efface the idea of decline which in the case of a long-lived genius is inevitable but on which nobody should dare to insist while the hands of the poet are still full of gifts as rare and ennobling as Mistral's will be to the end? Mr. Welter would, perhaps, have better served his own purpose by briefly stating the exact dates of the poems in a more condensed biography and by rearranging his whole poetical product in a distinct series of chapters which in conformity with his own taste he might have successfully crowned with *Calendau*. For the chief merit of Mr. Welter's book consists in his high-minded appreciation of *Calendau* which he terms a "goldenen Codex der Ehre, der eine Fülle der kernigsten Grundsätze enthält und durch die Glut und Wucht seiner Sprache besonders empfängliche Jünglingsseelen hinreissen muss" (p. 164). He excels all other (even the French) critics in climbing to the lofty heights to which Mistral's powerful inspiration has soared during the years of vigorous manhood. This period of Mistral's activity must be kept in front. Placed after *Calendau*, the *Epilogue* would have turned out one grand hymn and might have represented Mistral as the personification of his hero *Calendau*, having achieved like him great deeds, though not only in honor of the fervently beloved native soil but for the sake of the divine art of poetry. Assuming the beautiful shape of "Esterello," the genius of poetry crowns Mistral with the laurels of immortality!

Another merit of Mr. Welter's book consists in a selection of beautiful and exact translations of his own (for instance, from *Calendau*, pp. 135-147; from the *Song of the Rhone*, pp. 233-340), for which he may indeed rank with Bertuch. It is a pity that he did not choose to

favor us also with a masterly reproduction of the grand passage in which Estrello vividly protests against the destruction of the forests of Mount Ventour:

*Engendramen de sacrilège,
Dins lou vaste univers, dis, creson tout de siéu! . . .*

But perhaps he intends to publish later on a *Calendau* in German verse. To judge from the fine specimens here given we may congratulate ourselves on such a brilliant prospect. For Mr. Welter himself is a poet and in relating some picturesque episodes of Mistral's life he reveals an uncommon descriptive power and a marvelous vividness of expression. In recording, for instance, the day on which Mistral crossed Lake Geneva on board the yacht of the Princess of Brancovan (p. 236), he does not write prose but a jubilee in blank verse. A few trifles may meet with contradiction. In mentioning the *Trésor d'ou Félibrige* Mr. Welter compares Mistral's method of collecting the vocabulary and legends of the South chiefly by means of oral communication, with the analogous proceedings of *Matherbe's* (?) and *den Brüdern Grimm*. *Matherbe* and the Grimms in one breath! *Matherbe* was not a fit example to quote. His well-known assertion that he would like to take refuge with the *crocheteurs du Port au foin* must not be taken literally. It was but an outburst of his habitual querulous manner of uttering his disgust for Ronsard and the *Pléiade* (p. 241).

Why are we repeatedly told that the sublime poem of *Calendau* is a fit subject for *men*: "für Männerherzen, empfängliche Jünglings-seelen, eine beschränkte Anzahl stolzer und freiheitsfroher Männer?" Women especially are indebted to the great poet for his creating such wonderful types of the "ideal woman;" for Mireio incorporates love faithful unto death, Nerto with her sweet innocent belief in God and pure love delivers frivolous Don Rodrigue from the hold of the hellish fiend, Esterello, as the genius of real love shields *Calendau* from the temptations of base sensuality! Why, I wonder, are women not to be counted among the grateful admirers of *Calendau*?

Every time I peruse an essay or a detailed study on Mistral I sorely miss the scholar's grateful acknowledgment of the fact that the great poet included in the splendid framework

of modern poetry some brilliant gems of ancient French origin: Estrello, for instance, in encouraging her lover, evokes some touching scenes from *Aliscans*, and the *Song of the Rhone* carries with its waves the memory of the ancient blissful time when tender-hearted Nicolette "en coustume de pichot fanfouniaire," returned from distant lands to the castle of "Bèu-Caire" where faithful Aucassin pined for her love.

M. T. MINCKWITZ.

Karlsruhe.

GOETHE'S POEMS.

Goethe's Poems. Selected and edited with introduction and notes by CHARLES HARRIS, Ph. D. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1899. xvii, 286 pp.

THIS small volume contains six pages of introduction, one hundred and seventy of text, and one hundred and five of notes. The selections are chronological and almost without exception excellent. The notes confine themselves to necessary explanations, and also give the history of the origin of each poem, as far as this is known. There is an air of great carefulness about the notes, about the whole book in fact. Errors in printing have been reduced to a minimum.

While the work is characterized by excellence and is a distinct contribution to our Goethe text-book literature, one does occasionally meet with an idea or a statement in the notes to which one cannot subscribe. The most obvious are the following.

Selection 2 (p. 175). *Profound* is too strong an adjective in the sentence "The three years of his student life at Leipzig were of *profound* influence in Goethe's development."

Again, the same paragraph later on reads: "but the stimulus given him by his associates and the social, intellectual, and artistic life of the city (Leipzig) were impulses to rapid growth, *probably unequalled in his later career*."

Exception is to be taken to the last statement. The period of Goethe's youth which stands out pre-eminently in point of growth above all others is that of Strassburg. What intellectual stimulus of Leipzig compares for one moment with that gained from contact with Herder?

What life-giving power the vigorous, thoroughly German atmosphere of Goethe's Strassburg surroundings had! How much more stimulating than the semi-French character of his environment in Leipzig!

The statement regarding Behrisch, on the same page, proves misleading to students who learn of him for the first time. Nor did Goethe decide to destroy most of what he had previously written by reason of Behrisch's suggestion, but rather because of the discouraged state of mind in which he was by reason of adverse Leipzig criticism in general.

Selection 7 (p. 178). In enumerating the chief Strassburg influences, the essentially German atmosphere should certainly not be omitted. The three great shaping influences were Herder, Friederike Brion and the Germanizing element there encountered.

Selection 20 (p. 188). It might be well, when commenting upon Basedow and Lavater, to refer the student to the biographical list found in the back of the book.

Selection 23 (p. 191): "the fourth (stanza) has to do with communion with nature." Has it not rather to do with a longing for universality of life-experience?

Selection 34 (p. 198). The note on Frau von Stein seems unwise for pupils who here become acquainted with her for the first time. A simple statement of facts would be far preferable.

Selection 35 (p. 199): *reinste Nerve* needs either translation or explanation.

Selection 43 (p. 206). The following statement in regard to the question of unity of *An den Mond* would seem to be an exaggeration: "The transitions in thought . . . are totally without justification in anything that goes before them." The thought of the poem is somewhat as follows.—The poet wanders forth for a stroll in the moonlight in quest of peace of soul. As the lovely light of the moon rests upon him, he does not forget that in a similar manner there rest upon his career the gentle glances of a loving friend.—Lines seven and eight must be noticed, as they pave the way for the otherwise wholly abrupt close of the poem.—As he hears the Ilm across the meadows he is reminded of days of former love now passed: he also prays the stream to

whisper new melodies to his poetic ear. Then his mind reverts to the thought of friendship and its inestimable blessings. Thus interpreted the poem possesses some degree of unity—more is not claimed for it.

Selection 55 (p. 212). It will hardly be possible for a majority of Goethe-students to agree with the statement: "It is difficult to believe that Goethe's presence at Weimar made any essential difference in the fortunes of the little duchy."

Selection 68 (p. 221). The "conclusion" should be: *Let each one then look to himself*, rather than that "men are not alike."

Selection 71 (p. 223). Goethe's maxims are somewhat underrated. Goethe was pre-eminently a sage whose good fortune it was also to be a poet. Thus it happens that frequently bits of great practical wisdom are met with in his maxims. It is easily possible to do full justice to Goethe the poet, and at the same time admire many of his proverbs.

Selection 91 (p. 237). *Die Meile* is nearer four and a-half than five English miles (4.62).

The above are the chief defects noticed. Compared with the many excellencies of the notes in general they are few indeed. Some readers will wish that the selection of poems had been made longer. A hundred more pages would increase the value of the book materially. A helpful biographical list of six pages and an index of first lines complete this excellent little volume.

W. A. ADAMS.

Dartmouth College.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE.

Der heimkehrende Gatte und sein Weib in der Weltliteratur. Litteraturhistorische Abhandlung von W. SPLETTSTÖSSER. Berlin: Meyer und Müller, 1899.

It is to be regretted that the author of the present dissertation did not restrict his investigations to the Volkslied, the form of literature with which he seems to have the widest acquaintance. His quotations range from Russian popular songs to Portuguese romances, from Serbian Volkslieder to Scottish ballads. All this is good as far as it goes, but it does not go very far. A really thorough investiga-

tion into the occurrence of the "returning husband" motive in the primitive ballad literature of Europe would have had great value for the student of comparative literature and would alone have sufficed to fill a volume. Instead, however, of confining himself to one field, Dr. Splettstösser professes to trace his motive through the "Weltliteratur," which means, as far as modern literature is concerned, that he picks out two or three isolated examples, such as Tennyson's *Enoch Arden*, Maupassant's *Le Retour*, Houwald's *Heimkehr*. This does not satisfy even the modest claims he himself makes for his essay: "So will denn vorliegende Abhandlung keine Vollständigkeit erzielt, wohl aber nach Möglichkeit angestrebt haben." Had Dr. Splettstösser looked more carefully into the German "Schicksalsdrama," or the modern French novel, he would have found at least a dozen examples for every one he quotes. At the best, however, little is gained by investigations of this kind unless they are confined strictly to primitive forms of literature, and the most that can be said for Dr. Splettstösser's essay is that he has made a beginning for such an investigation. But here also there are too many omissions. Was, for instance, the rich ballad literature of Denmark not worth an examination? And surely it is a little perverse to devote pages of discussion to *canti popolari* in remote Italian dialects, and to neglect such obvious sources as the German popular sagas. Even so familiar a collection as the Grimms' *Fairy Tales*, not to speak of their *Deutsche Sagen*, would have furnished an example or two. Dr. Splettstösser also seems to me unnecessarily diffuse in defining his motive; he discusses not only the returning husband in all possible forms, but also the returning lover, a motive which surely belongs to a different category. Here, again, a greater limitation would have been a gain. On the whole, the essay is not without interest, but too incomplete to have much scientific value.

JOHN G. ROBERTSON.

University of Strassburg, Germany.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE DIPHTHONG *oi* IN NEW ENGLAND.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In one of the last articles written by Prof. W. D. Whitney ("Examples of sporadic

and partial phonetic change in English, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 4, 32), he supported Prof. Tarbell's strictures upon the dogma of the invariability of phonetic change in language (*Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, 1886, p. 1) by further developing one of Prof. Tarbell's illustrations—that of the sporadic shortening of a long *o* to a real short *o* in New England. Another interesting illustration of this is afforded by a phonetic change, interesting in itself, which apparently must have been making its way for some time in New England, though not, so far as I can ascertain, noted in print, and quite novel to me in spite of Yankee birth and frequent visits to various parts of New England.

A Bostonian used the phrase "loin of veal" recently in my hearing, pronouncing *loin* as a disyllable—*lō in*, with *o* as in *lo*, *i* as in *oin*. The possibility that this was an eye-reading of a word by some strange chance unfamiliar was disposed of by the fact that the word *coin*, given in a sentence for the purpose, was similarly pronounced, but not so markedly. I set the pronunciation down as an individualism until a week or two later, when I heard a native of Concord, twice the age of the person first spoken of, pronounce the word *soil* in the same way that *loin* had been pronounced, only if possible more so, with an *o* so close and so carefully rounded, as to suggest, when its tension was relaxed, an incipient *w* in the hiatus before the *i*. Of three other Bostonians, two pronounced these and similar words in this way. The diphthongs remained clear in *sir-loin* and *tenderloin*. All are persons of education, but so circumstanced that their native habits of speech are not likely to be disturbed by foreign influences.

The converse phenomenon is noticeable in my own speech and that of other New Englanders. I naturally pronounce *poet*, *poi et*, and *poetry*, *poi etry*, and tend when speaking unsophisticatedly to pronounce *going*, *goi ing*, a form, which, as Dr. C. P. G. Scott suggests to me, may be equated with forms which preceded and led to Somerset *gwaa-yn*, pronounced with the diphthong *a-i* (cf. Elworthy, *West Somerset words*, s. v. *gwain*), and to Negro *gwine*.

As bearing upon the matter of the inception of sound changes sporadically in particular words of a group, it seems possible it might be worth the while of some one having the oppor-

tunity and inclination, to ascertain to what extent the analysis of the diphthong spoken of has developed through the group of words with *oi* in the case of individual persons. That phonetic changes should ever have been assumed to be, or considered as invariable, seems of course strange at the present day. One would think the simple fact that words in frequent use must change quicker than those not in frequent use, would naturally suggest itself to any one considering the matter,—the word *wan*, for example, as being somewhat bookish and rarely used, lagging behind others of its class in the change of the *a* wrought by the *w*. But it would certainly be of interest to ascertain the facts regarding a well-marked and (in a geographical sense) apparently somewhat limited change, like the one spoken of, and the results would certainly possess illustrative value.

While upon the subject of an American pronunciation, I may perhaps be pardoned if I record a fragment of conversation between two persons I heard recently upon a Sound steamer. One, A, was a southern woman, with deliciously deliquescent vowels; the other, B, was a Northern youth, who articulated with noticeable care, and whose pronunciation, so far as I am able to judge, was uniformly correct. A remarked, "I don't see any stewed tomatoes on the *menu*, do you?" B answered interrogatively, "Stewed tomatoes?" A said "tomay toes", B said "tomahtoes". Both said "stooed".

CLARENCE GRIFFIN CHILD.

University of Pennsylvania.

OBITUARY.

WILLIAM MALONE BASKERVILL.

DIED, SEPTEMBER 6, 1899.

(A tribute read before the Modern Language Association, December 29, 1899.)

William Malone Baskervill was a native of Tennessee, and for the last eighteen years of his life (1881-1899) labored in Tennessee at Vanderbilt University. The influence of this institution was deeply felt in education throughout the Central and Southern Mis-

issippi Valley, and he had unusual opportunity, therefore, to affect strongly a widely representative body of young men. Comporting with Southern conditions and Southern needs, it was as a teacher, mingling intimately with his students, instructing them in classroom, and receiving them cordially into his home, that the best work of his life was done.

Born in the spring of 1850, he was not quite fifty years old at his death. He was already in the twenties before his own life interest was aroused, as a student of Randolph-Macon College in Virginia, by coming in contact with a body of forceful men. The teacher who first exercised a profound influence upon him and who was a warm friend and an inspiration to the last, was Thomas R. Price. The young student was induced to go to Germany in 1874, where he studied at Leipzig under Wuelker. Coming back home and teaching awhile at Wofford College in South Carolina, he returned finally for his Doctor-examination in 1880, his dissertation, an edition of the Anglo-Saxon *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*, appearing in the spring of 1881, and being published in *Anglia*. The same year (1881) he was called to the newly established chair of English at Vanderbilt University, where he remained the rest of his life.

He was representative of the educational endeavor of his section in many ways. He was closely identified with the movement for raising educational standards in the South by the organization of a thorough system of strong private preparatory schools. When the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges was organized in 1895, as senior representative he was chairman of its first committee on English, and in 1897 he was present with his committee in New York at the deliberations of the several committees in joint conference, the first time the Southern States had been represented.

For the series of Anglo-Saxon texts under the general editorship of one of his former instructors, Prof. Harrison, he edited *Andreas*. Far away from the large libraries, the result was an edition that left much to be desired, he himself felt; and he always had in mind a new and worthy one. With Prof. Harrison he likewise edited a *Students' Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon*, and the two were again associated on the staff of editors of the *Century Dictionary*.

The last joint work of the two friends was an *Anglo-Saxon Reader* for beginners.

But Prof. Baskervill's truest interests and best work in his later years, growing out of his environment and his teaching, lay not in editing books on Old English, but in literature. He was a close student of the English prose style of his own century, an interest indicated by warm essays on Thackeray and Dr. Holmes, and by his *English Grammar*, based upon English as he found it actually written. Most of all, from his central position in the South, he was concerned in the literary conditions of his section. It is his booklets on *Southern Writers: Biographical and Critical Studies*, collected into one volume, that his name will be most closely associated with, and by which he will be best remembered. Though he did not live to complete the work, the essays that were finished have one marked significance. They were critical, yet full of sympathy; told from the point of view of one who had lived the life of these writers, who had grown up with them, and who took them to heart as in their verses and stories they appeared one by one.

In his death the cause of education and literary endeavor in his section lost a stout heart and true supporter, and the Modern Language Association, with which he was identified from its beginning, a devoted friend.

J. B. H.

BRIEF MENTION.

According to the official returns, the number of women studying at the German universities this winter is six hundred and sixty-four. Of these no less than six hundred and nine are to be found at the Prussian universities alone: Berlin comes first with four hundred and six, Breslau follows with forty-seven, Bonn has forty-four, Göttingen thirty-seven, Halle thirty-three, Kiel twenty, Königsberg fourteen, Marburg eight. At the three Bavarian universities only six women are officially notified as studying, five in Erlangen, one in Würzburg. Tübingen has five, Freiburg sixteen, Heidelberg thirteen, Strassburg fifteen. The *Personalverzeichnisse* for Giessen, Jena, Leipzig, Rostock

mention no women at all; but this does not necessarily mean that women are excluded from these universities. In Leipzig, for instance, it has long been the custom for the *Docenten* to allow women to "hospitieren," although no official cognizance has been taken of the fact. Jena, again, does not, as a matter of principle, admit women to its lectures, but it organises special courses for them in the holidays, and these courses, we believe, are largely taken advantage of. It is a matter of regret that the *Personalverzeichnisse* of the universities, excepting those of Heidelberg and Strassburg, do not specify to which faculty the women students belong. Of the thirteen in Heidelberg, twelve have inscribed themselves in the philosophical faculty, one belongs to the theological faculty; while in Strassburg there are three women students of medicine, there is one of natural science, the remainder belonging to the philosophical faculty.

As its annual Christmas gift to its members, the Goethe-Gesellschaft has issued this year the second volume of "Goethe und die Romantik," edited by C. Schüddekopf and O. Walzel. The first volume, which appeared last year, was devoted to Goethe's correspondence with the older Romantic School; the present volume contains his correspondence with the younger Romanticists, including, of course, Bettina von Arnim, and extending as far down as Immermann, Platen and Heine. The importance of this work for the study of Goethe's later years cannot be sufficiently emphasized. Notwithstanding excellent books like Harnack's "Goethe in der Epoche seiner Vollendung," we are still far from being as well informed on the poet's relations to his contemporaries after Schiller's death, as we are with regard to the friendships of his earlier life. No chapter of Goethe's life is so full of gaps as that which deals with his attitude towards this group of writers who were the "moderns" of their day; nor is it possible to estimate properly Goethe's influence upon the nineteenth century without first understanding how far he sympathized with the Romantic Movement. The value of these two volumes lies in their bringing together all data bearing on Goethe's personal relations with the leading writers of that movement.